DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 688 CS 002 402

TITLE	Oversight Hearing on Reading Programs and Hearing on H. R. 8304 and H. R. 9048; Hearings before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 94th Congress, First Session on H. R. 8304 and H. R. 9048, November 13, 1975.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	90p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; Childrens Books; Community Involvement; *Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; Functional Illiteracy; *Literacy; National Competency Tests; *National Programs; National Surveys; *Reading Achievement; *Reading Programs; Reading Tests
IDENTIFIERS	H R 8304; H R 9048; National Assessment of Educational Progress; Reading is Fundamental; Right to Read

ABSTRACT

Two bills concerning national reading programs were the subjects of a hearing held in Washington, D. C. on November 13, 1975, by the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. H. R. 9048 is a bill to provide federal assistance for the distribution of inexpensive books to school children; H. R. 8304 is a bill to amend the national reading improvement program to provide more flexibility in the types of projects which can be funded. Representatives present for the hearing were Carl Perkins, Shirley Chisholm, Leo Zeferetti, George Miller, Albert Quie, and John Buchanan. Topics for presentation and discussion were the level of national reading achievement and literacy, factors involved in reading achievement, the National Assessment of Educational Progress, the Right to Read Program, and reading academies for adults sponsored by Right to Read. Statements about the above topics were presented by Terrel Bell, U.S. Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Andrew Porter, Acting Associate Director for Basic Skills, National Institute of Education; and several of the officials of the above named national programs. (MKM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

CS

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON READING PROGRAMS AND HEARING ON H.R. 8304 AND H.R. 9048

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-FOURTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 8304 and H.R. 9048

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.
NOVEMBER 13, 1975

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor
CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman*

2

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
62-049
WASHINGTON : 1975

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii (on leave)
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM "BILL" CLAY, Missouri
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
JAIME BENITEZ, Puerto Rico
MICHAEL BLOUIN, Iowa
ROBERT CORNELL, Wisconsin
TED RISENHOOVER, Oklahoma
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
EDWARD BEARD, Rhode Island
LEO ZEFERETTI, New York
GEORGE MILLER, California
RONALD MOTTL, Ohio
TIM HALL, Illinois

ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
ALPHONZO BELL, California
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
RONALD A. SARASIN, Connecticut
JOHN BUCHANAN, Alabama
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
VIRGINIA SMITH, Nebraska

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii (on leave)
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
TED RISENHOOVER, Oklahoma
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
RONALD MOTTL, Ohio
TIM HALL, Illinois
MICHAEL BLOUIN, Iowa
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
LEO ZEFERETTI, New York
GEORGE MILLER, California

ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
ALPHONZO BELL, California
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
JOHN BUCHANAN, Alabama
LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont

CONTENTS

Page

Hearing held in Washington, D.C., November 13, 1975 — 1

Text of H.R. 8304 — 2

Text of H.R. 9048 — 3

Statement of—

- Bell, Terrel H., U.S. Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Accompanied by Dr. Andrew Porter, Dr. Charles A. Shipman, Richard A. Hastings, and Dr. Albert L. Alford — 13
- Cain, Edwin E., Director of Federal/State Programs, Minnesota Department of Education, St. Paul, Minn — 37
- Forbes, Roy H., project director, National Assessment for Educational Progress — 75
- McNamara, Mrs. Robert S., chairman of Reading Is Fundamental, accompanied by Dr. Sydney Nelson, President and Barbara B. Atkinson, National Program Director — 62
- Turnbull, William W., president, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J. — 80

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, etc.—

- Bell, Hon. Terrel H., Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, prepared statement of — 4
- Cain, Edwin E., director of Federal/State Programs, Minnesota Department of Education, St. Paul, Minn.:
  - Prepared statement of — 29
  - "The Ambitious Goal of Right to Read," an article entitled — 34
- Douglass, Joe, executive assistant for Intergovernmental Relations, Colorado Department of Education, Denver, Colo., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated Nov. 19, 1975 — 85
- Forbes, Roy H., director, National Assessment of Educational Programs, prepared statement of — 70
- McNamara, (Mrs.) Robert S., chairman of Reading Is Fundamental:
  - Location of RIF projects — 45
  - Newspaper articles:
    - 2d graders given books of their own — 52
    - A mom gets something done to help kids with reading — 55
    - Free books and a feeling that reading is fun, are objectives for Brooklyn RIF project — 56
    - Jungman kids get free books — 51
    - Knowing the joy of owning books — 49
    - Love of books brought home — 52
    - Migrant's kids get free books — 50
    - Opening the world of books to youngsters — 61
    - Reading is FUNdamental hopes to bring books to youngsters — 60
    - "Reading Is FUN (damental)" makes it to Austin — 57
    - RIF: Parents, teachers and clubs join to promote reading by children — 54
    - Students "grab" at book offer — 58
    - They're all ones for the books — 59
  - Prepared statement of — 41
- Porter, Dr. Andrew Acting Associate Director for Basic Skills, National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, prepared statement of — 16
- Turnbull, William W., president, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J., prepared statement of — 76

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON READING PROGRAMS AND HEARING ON H.R. 8304 AND H.R. 9048

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1975

House of Representatives,
Subcommittee on Elementary,
Secondary, and Vocational Education
of the Committee on Education and Labor,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10:05 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Carl D. Perkins (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Perkins, Chisholm, Zeferetti, Miller, Quie, and Buchanan.

Staff present: John F. Jennings, counsel for the majority and Christopher Cross, senior education consultant for the minority.

Chairman Perkins. The subcommittee will come to order.

The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education is conducting a hearing today on the status of reading achievement in the country.

The University of Texas recently conducted a survey of adults throughout the country which showed that more than 23 million people lack the basic ability to function in society. Millions of these people are not able to perform simple tasks, such as addressing an envelope or determining how much their employers owe them in pay. In large part, their inability to function is rooted in their inability to read.

We could hope that these people are mostly older people and that the schools are gradually improving our citizens' ability to read. Test results, however, seem to show the opposite. Scores on the verbal part of the Scholastic Aptitude Test have declined 44 points since 1962, with the greatest decline being experienced this past year.

We would like to know the reasons for these declines. Are our schools doing a poorer job than they have done in the past? Or are we dealing with a different type of student than we have in the past?

We know that the College Entrance Examination Board has appointed a special panel to analyze these scores, but we would like to know the thoughts of the witnesses today on this subject.

We would also like to know how those declines can be reconciled with a recent report issued by the National Assessment of Educational Progress showing a 2-percent increase since 1971 in the number of 17-year-olds who possess basic literacy skills. The National Assessment has also demonstrated that poor students, minority students, and rural students—all students who have traditionally shown low reading abililty—have increased their literacy to a significant degree since 1971.

Finally, we would like to know the views of the U.S. Office of Education on these reading surveys. We would also like to know how the Federal Right to Read program and the Reading Improvement Act are improving reading ability. And, we would like to hear the Administration's views on H.R. 9048, a bill to provide Federal assistance for the distribution of inexpensive books to school children and H.R. 8304, a bill to amend the national reading improvement program to provide more flexibility in the types of projects which can be funded, and for other purposes.

[Text of H.R. 8304 and H.R. 9048 follow:]

[H.R. 8304, 94th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To amend the national reading improvement program to provide more flexibility in the types of projects which can be funded, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

STATE LEADERSHIP AND TRAINING PROJECTS

SECTION 1. Section 705(a) of the Education Amendments of 1974 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Notwithstanding the other requirements of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to enter into agreements with State educational agencies for the carrying out by such agencies of leadership and training activities designed to prepare personnel throughout the State to conduct projects which have been demonstrated in that State or in other States to be effective in overcoming reading deficiencies.".

NATIONAL IMPACT READING PROGRAMS

SEC. 2. Part C of such Act is amended by adding the following new section after section 723:

"NATIONAL IMPACT READING PROGRAMS

"SEC. 724. The Commissioner is authorized to carry out, either directly or through grants or contracts, innovation and development projects and activities of national significance which show promise of having a substantial impact in overcoming reading deficiencies in youths and adults through incorporation into ongoing State and local educational systems.".

READING PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 705(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "Each such application shall set forth a reading program which provides for—" and by inserting in lieu thereof "Each such application shall, to the extent practicable, set for a reading program which provides for—".

(b) Section 705(c) of such Act is amended by striking out ", addition to meeting the requirements of subsection (b),".

(c) Section 705(e) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) No agreement may be entered into under this part unless the application submitted to the Commissioner has first been approved by the State educational agency.".

STATE ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

SEC. 4. Section 705 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) From the sums appropriated for the purposes of this part for any fiscal year, the Comimssioner may pay to each State educational agency, in addition to any amounts paid to such agency pursuant to subsection (a)(3) of this section, the amount necessary to meet the costs of carrying out its responsibilities under this section, including the costs of the advisory council required to be established pursuant to subsection (d). However, such amount may not exceed 5 per centum of the total amount of grants under this part made within that State for that fiscal year.".

ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS BY AN ADMINISTRATIVE HEAD OF AN EDUCATION AGENCY

SEC. 5. Section 408(a)(3) of the General Education Provisions Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) to accept on behalf of the United States, gifts or donations of services, money, or property (real, personal, or mixed; tangible or intangible) made for the benefit of such agency or designated for any activity authorized to be carried out by such agency;".

[H.R. 9048, 94th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To amend title VII of the Education Amendments of 1974 to provide for a program of distribution of inexpensive books to schoolchildren

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part C of title VII of the Education Amendments of 1974 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"INEXPENSIVE BOOK DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM FOR READING MOTIVATION

"SEC. 724. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to enter into a contract with a nonprofit group or public organization whose primary purpose is to motivate children to read. Under terms of this contract, the Commissioner shall pay to any publisher or local book distributor which meets the requirement of subsection (b) the Federal share of the cost of inexpensive books purchased by a nonprofit community group or other public agency from that publisher or local book distributor for purposes of a reading motivational program through book distribution (by gift, loan, or sale at a nominal price) to children in a locality who are enrolled in preelementary, elementary, or secondary schools.

"(b) The Commissioner shall make no payments to any publisher or local distributor of the Federal share of books purchased from that publisher or local book distributor by a nonprofit organization under contract under subsection (a) unless that publisher or local book distributor follows, with respect to such purchase, the same policies relating to discounts which are followed by that publisher or local book distributor with respect to purchases made by other nonprofit agencies or organizations under similar circumstances in the absence of Federal funding or offers even greater discounts for books purchased under provisions of this section.

"(c) Contracts entered into under subsection (a) shall provide that each reading motivational program of the nonprofit community group or public agency for distributing inexpensive books to school children in a locality shall meet such conditions and standards as the Commissioner determines to be appropriate, and that no payment of the Federal share of books purchased from any publisher or local book distributor shall be made unless the contractor so specified in subsection (a) certifies to the Commissioner that such conditions and standards have been met with respect to such program. In addition, the group or organization with whom the Commissioner contracts under subsection (a) shall provide technical assistance to nonprofit community groups or public agencies applying for assistance under this section.

"(d) For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'nonprofit', when used in connection with any agency or organization means such an agency or organization owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(2) the term 'Federal share' means, with respect to the cost of books purchased by a nonprofit community group or other public agency for a program in a locality for distributing such books to school children in that locality, 50 per centum of the cost of that agency or organization for such books for such program.

"(3) the term 'preelementary' means, with respect to a school, a day or residential school which provides preelementary education, as determined under State law, except that it does not include education for children below the age of 3, "(4) the term 'elementary' means, with respect to a school, a day or residential school which provides elementary education, as determined under State law, and

"(5) the term 'secondary' means, with respect to a school, a day or residential school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law, except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12.".

(b) Section 732 of such amendments is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of section 724, relating to inexpensive book distribution program for reading motivation, $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and $9,000,000 for each of the following two fiscal years. Under such conditions as the Commissioner determines to be appropriate, 10 per centum of the amounts appropriated each fiscal year shall be available for contracts for technical assistance to carry out the provisions of section 724.".

Chairman PERKINS. Our first witness today is the Honorable Terrel H. Bell from the Office of Education.

Commissioner Bell, we welcome you here today. You may proceed.

[Prepared statement of Dr. T. H. Bell follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HONORABLE T. H. BELL, U.S. COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this distinguished Subcommittee today on behalf of the Education Division to discuss the operation of the Right-to-Read program and the Administration's proposed amendments in H.R. 8304.

I am accompanied this morning by Dr. Andrew Porter, Acting Associate Director, Basic Skills Group, National Institute of Education; Dr. Charles D. Shipman, Acting Director, Right to Read Program, U.S. Office of Education; Mr. Richard A. Hastings, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation (Education); and Dr. Albert L. Alford, Assistant Commissioner for Legislation, U.S. Office of Education. Upon completion of my statement, I shall ask Dr. Porter, who has been involved in an ongoing analysis of the decline of test scores and related phenomena to give you a short briefing on the findings of NIE in this matter.

OVERVIEW OF THE RIGHT-TO-READ PROGRAM

The purpose of the Right-to-Read Program is to employ a comprehensive strategy to coalesce all available means at the local, State, and national levels to resolve the reading crisis in America. Since its beginning the program has developed 5 objectives: (1) to inform the public that there is a nationwide reading problem; (2) to help determine what important changes need to take place to eliminate the problem, (3) to assist those who need to participate in making such changes, (4) to identify existing public and private resources which can be brought to bear on the problem, and (5) to plan and support exemplary demonstration reading programs for dissemination and replication.

To accomplish these goals, the Right-to-Read program has had an appropriation of $12 million until this year, when the appropriation was increased to $17 million.

The activities funded can be summarized as follows:

—we have grants to almost all the States to develop the capacity to assume responsibility to improve reading achievement

—we have supported over 200 school- and community-based demonstration programs to stimulate local investment in reading among preschoolers, children, and adults

—we have funded 34 projects to facilitate changes in reading education programs for teachers and administrators

—we have provided for the establishment of 20 reading academies to serve persons not being reached by the schools

—we have supported 26 projects designed to have a national impact on reading activities

The Right-to-Read activity has also served as a major catalytic agent in bringing about a concentration of interest and resources from other programs on the reading problem. The State Leadership phase of the Right-to-Read Program in many States has developed an allied effort with Titles I, II, and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to achieve a more intensive impact on reading deficiencies. The Adult Basic Education Program and Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have also contributed significantly to the furtherance of reading objectives. The National Institute of Education has also assisted the Right-to-Read effort immeasurably in supporting basic research designed to more specifically identify reading problems and also in convening conferences in which various approaches to overcoming reading difficulties were discussed and agreed upon.

Prior to the passage of P. L. 93-380, the Right-to-Read Program utilized funds made available under the Cooperative Research Act. The final year of funding for 184 such active projects was provided in FY 75. These 184 projects included 51 State leadership programs, 21 school-based programs, 20 reading academies, 34 teacher preparation programs, 5 national impact programs and 53 community-based programs.

As this funding cycle draws to a close, we have reached a milestone in the overall Right-to-Read Program. Title VII, P.L. 93-380 provides for the continuation of only two of these program components—the exemplary Reading Improvement Projects for preschool and elementary children and the Reading Academies for adults. Activities accounting for over 77 percent of our funds in FY 75 cannot be continued under the new law. If the other essential components of the overall effort are to be continued, namely the State leadership program and the national impact thrust, the amendments contained in H.R. 8304 need to be enacted.

THE READING PROBLEM

Mr. Chairman, we feel the more comprehensive approach we propose to the reading problem is essential to overcoming illiteracy. Even with sophisticated communication systems and an advanced public education endeavor, the United States has approximately 20 million functionally illiterate adults according to the 1971 Harris Poll and the recently completed Adult Level Performance Survey. In addition, there are a substantial number of elementary and secondary school students with severe reading problems. Still millions more have the skills of reading but do not use them.

Several recent studies have also focused on the extent of our reading problem. As I have indicated, Dr. Porter is with me today to briefly summarize these various studies and discuss their findings.

THE STATE LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

In order to provide a comprehensive approach to solving the reading problem, the Right-to-Read Program has worked closely with State educational agencies.

We believe that the leadership role of State departments of education is one of the most effective approaches for improving literacy in the United States. The State departments of education have the legal authority, responsibility, and the potential capability to facilitate solutions to America's literacy needs. These State agencies have a leadership role to perform in stimulating and facilitating the cooperative efforts of the major educational agencies of the State including local school districts and those institutions of higher education preparing teachers. Such a coordinated effort would contribute significantly to the solution of this major educational problem.

To this end, we have given grants to State educational agencies for leadership training, and developmental kinds of services to local educational agencies. The financial investment in the State educational agency leadership program in Fiscal Year 1975 was a total of $5.2 million or over 40 percent of the total Right-to-Read budget.

The enactment of Section 1 of H.R. 8304 which amends Section 705(a) of the Education Amendments of 1974 will authorize us to continue this most essential State leadership effort of the Right-to-Read Program. Without this amendment the coordinated effort in each State to provide across-the-board leadership to achieve the Right to Read goals for improved reading would disappear.

National impact program

Next, I would like to discuss our National Impact Programs. These programs have broad implications for education generally and embrace the concept of the multiplier effect. Such specialized programs are designed to benefit massive numbers of people at low per capita costs. Some of the more recent programs which have been developed and are in need of continued support if implementation is to be realized are: (1) the adult TV reading program, (2) the assessment of functional literacy of 17 years old, (3) identification and dissemination of promising reading practices, and (4) development of preschool reading kits.

The financial investment in these programs in Fiscal Year 1975 was $569,000. No provision is currently made in Title VII to continue these significant initiatives in the overall Right-to-Read Program. However, the enactment of the amendments before you in H.R. 8304 would authorize us to continue the national impact programs.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would like to submit two documents for the record which provide additional insight into the National Impact Programs. They are: (1) a copy of the Press Summary of the National Assessment of Educational Progress Study entitled "Functional Literacy—Basic Reading Performance"; and (2) Copies of three Right-to-Read Newsletters; Vol. I, No. 7; Vol. I, No. 11; and Vol. 2, No. 1.

Preservice teacher preparation programs

Another aspect of the Right-to-Read program in its final year of funding is the preservice teacher preparation programs. Since 1970 approximately three million Federal dollars have been awarded to 34 institutions of higher education in 26 States to revise their preservice programs for preparing elementary teachers especially in the area of reading. This represents the only activity in the Right-to-Read Program in the area of preservice teacher preparation since its inception in 1970. These demonstration preservice teacher preparation programs are in their final year of development and funding. No provision is made in Title VII to continue them.

School-based demonstration projects

We also attempt to stimulate local initiative to meet the Nation's reading needs by funding exemplary projects. Twenty-one school-based demonstration programs located in 19 States are in their final year of funding. These projects provide for the upgrading of the skills of teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals, librarians, and others associated with the enhancement of reading. This phase of our program provides an emphasis for the development of existing school staff rather than for the employment of new personnel. Approximately one million Federal dollars were awarded nationally in FY 1975 to support these efforts.

Part A of Title VII of P.L. 93-380 provides continuing authority to fund reading instruction for preschool and elementary children. However, Part A also establishes 14 mandatory requirements for the demonstration reading program which we feel will make ineligible many small, high-quality reading projects.

For instance, in fiscal year 1975, we funded school-based projects with grants as small as $11,620, $11,653, and $17,700, when the average grant for the 28 school-based projects was $45,881. Thus, if a school district where three schools, consisting of 500, 300, and 600 students, respectively, were to apply, it could easily take well over $100,000 to do all fourteen of the requirements in an effective manner. Requirements (1) and (8), diagnostic and achievement testing, might cost $10 per student, an item that alone would cost $14,000. Somewhat similar sub-total figures could be ascribed to each of the other remaining requirements. Given the total fiscal year 1976 appropriation for Title VII, it is impossible for the administering office to award grants at an average of $100,000.

Furthermore, these 14 requirements tend to be more appropriate for less sophisticated reading projects which have had little experience. For instance, we would question whether a project which has recently completed two years of staff development should be required, in order to be eligible for funding, to provide additional staff development regardless of need.

Consequently, we have propose in H.R. 8304 to have projects rated against these 14 criteria, but approval not be dependent upon a rigorous application of each criterion.

The reading academies (sec. 723, Part C of Title VII)

The most recent component of the Right-to-Read Program, started in FY 1975, is the reading academy. The basic concept of the academy is that it brings literacy services to out-of-school youth and adults who would not otherwise receive such assistance and instruction. To this end, Right-to-Read provides technical assistance in such specific areas as diagnosis and prescription, methodology and evaluation to its grantees. Another major capacity building effort is in the area of mobilization of the community in order to locate and train volunteers to help in the literacy effort as well as provide other needed services.

A total of $1.4 million was granted to 20 projects which range from $45,000 to $98,000. The programs are currently in operation in 17 States and are slated to furnish reading assistance and instruction to approximately 8,000 youth and adults. We propose to continue this activity under Section 723 of Title VII of P.L. 93-380.

Special emphasis projects (Sec. 721, Part C)

Another new program created by P.L. 93-380 is that of the special emphasis projects. The purpose of this new program is to help determine the effectiveness of intensive instruction by reading specialists and reading teachers. In Fiscal Year 1976, 20 projects will be funded with an estimated cost of $1 million. Essentially, there are two types of projects to be supported. The first type is designed to provide for the teaching of reading by a reading specialist for all children in the first and second grades and the second type is to provide intensive vacation reading instruction programs for elementary school children who are performing below grade level in the reading area.

H.R. 9048—DISTRIBUTION OF READING BOOKS

Before I turn to a summary of the testimony and a restatement of the relationship of the Right-to-Read Program to the amendments proposed in H.R. 8304, permit me to provide a brief statement on the content of H.R. 9048. This bill is before you as a proposed amendment to the Education Amendments of 1974 as well. It provides for a program of distribution of inexpensive books to be used in the teaching of reading to schoolchildren. Certainly the purpose of this bill is desirable. The need for an abundant supply of good reading materials for students is obvious. However, we do not feel it is appropriate for the Federal Government to assume responsibility for an activity which has achieved considerable success and support in the private sector. Moreover, we would prefer to provide limited resources to the accomplishment of the more comprehensive objectives already outlined.

Summary

As a closing remark, and in support of H.R. 8304, I would like to make the observation that if the national problem of illiteracy is to be solved, it will require a cooperative and coordinated effort on the part of all major educational agencies within the individual States.

The Right-to-Read Program has demonstrated impressive success in working in concert with the State and local educational agencies and the institutions of higher education in improving instruction in reading. We are most desirous of continuing those activities which hold the greatest promise for further improvement in this important subject area. The enactment of the amendments proposed in H.R. 8304 will help us accomplish this goal.

The literacy problem is not a new one in the United States. Great amounts of local, State, and Federal tax dollars go into this educational endeavor. I feel that the structure for tackling this problem has already been established. Our goal is to encourage that structure to cooperatively dedicate its total effort toward an optimum solution. We need the amendments proposed in H.R. 8304 to achieve such an outcome.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to appear before this committee. Before we turn to questions and answers, I would suggest that the activities of our Office in the Right-to-Read Program have not been isolated from other purposeful developments within the Division of Education to enhance the reading program. We have worked extensively and quite cooperatively with the National Institute of Education on the exchange of information, ideas, research, practical results, and many other matters. As an indication of the interaction which occurs between the U.S. Office of Education and the National Institute of Education, I would like to ask Dr. Porter of NIE to give you a brief review of test score results which have received considerable attention in recent media releases.

[The following information is data received in response to Mr. Quie's questioning of Dr. Bell later in the testimony.]

Attachment

Following is additional data requested by Congressman Quie regarding objective achievement data indicating the success of Right-To-Read programs funded under our State Leadership and Training effort. This program is one for which we have requested authority to continue the program.

RIGHT TO READ STATES PROGRAMS

Only the eleven original Right to Read states have reviewed funding since 1972. Twenty more began their Right to Read Programs in 1973. The remaining came in on July 1, 1975. The regulations did not require the states to conduct yearly evaluations and to compile test data from the local school districts. All are in some phase of evaluation and many have contracted with outside agencies to conduct indepth evaluation studies at the completion of their grants which will occur on September 30, 1976.

The information presented here is a compilation of a sampling of data gathered from some of the original states.

A major SEA impact which needs to be considered in addtion to the training of staff is in the reevaluation of teacher certification requirements. In all cases the number of courses required in reading has increased at both the elementary and secondary levels.

MINNESOTA

On February 1, 1974 a news release entitled "Evaluation Shows Right to Read Effective Program for Pupils" was issued from the Minnesota Department of Education. The following information was taken from that source.

Elementary pupils enrolled in schools with Minnesota Right to Read programs tend to achieve more reading objectives correctely than those pupils in non-Right to Read schools who were used as a comparison.

The results were revealed in an evaluation of the first phase of the Minnesota Right to Read program, the state's literacy campaign. Tested were students in 11 Right to Read schools and 11 non-Right to Read schools who volunteered to act as a comparison group.

A total of 3,000 students in Grades 2, 4 and 6 were evaluated on reading skills. Right to Read students outperformed their counterparts in non-Right to Read districts in 40 of 55 "significant" comparisons, a 2.5 :1 ratio.

"The evaluation data of Phase I indicated that the Right to Read program is worthwhile as far as improving pupils' achievement levels in reading," said Alton Greenfield, assistant director, Minnesota Right to Read.

Phase I of the Minnesota Right to Read program began in May 1972. A total of 120 school districts and nonpublic schools applied for the pilot program and 22 were selected to represent the state's 11 development regions.

Eleven Right to Read schools were chosen for the Phase I evaluation by the Minnesota Right to Read staff and 11 non-Right to Read schools were selected from the 98 which orignally made application for Phase I but were not chosen at that time.

The evaluation was conducted by the Minnesota Department of Education in cooperation with the McGraw-Hill Corporation.

ARIZONA

Arizona reports that a policy has been legislated by the state establishing reading proficiency for high school graduation. The original Right to Read Commission had recommended this change.

The State Board of Education has established as the levels required: at the end of 8th grade a 6th grade level of proficiency is required; at the end of the 12th grade a 9th grade level of proficiency is required.

They were able to report that a Right to Read high school that was one of the first to begin compliance with the minimal reading proficiency policy reported the following statistics for the class of 1976:

September, 1972—323 students tested: 16% reading on or above 9th grade level; 38% reading on 3rd or 4th grade level.

May 1974—234 students tested: 69% reading on or above 9th grade level; 2% reading on 3rd or 4th grade level.

The assessment was made by the high school faculty and an evaluation specialist of the State Department.

Their conclusion was that this faculty has piloted a very successful program for educating bi-lingual and low-vocabulary English speaking students. This high school became a Right to Read school in 1973–74. Fifty percent of this population have Spanish or Indian surnames.

FLORIDA

Florida reports results of statewide achievement testing for grades 3 and 6 in 1973 and 1974. The data was reported by the local districts and gathered at the state level. Summaries of their results indicate that:

Grade three.—A noticeable improvement in reading performance on vocabulary and comprehension measures was made in 1973–74 as compared with previous years. In every school and on every test more students scored above grade level than below.

Grade six.—A greater proportion of scores were at or above grade level for 1973–74 when compared with previous years.

Their conclusion was that there appears to be a noticeable increase of percentages of students performing at or above grade level for 1973–74, as compared to previous years and that there was a greater percentage scoring at or above grade level than scoring below compared to previous years. These two trends indicate that the increased emphasis on reading in the Florida schools is beginning to have a positive influence on student achievement.

There are twenty-seven school districts in the five regions of Florida. All are Right to Read Districts.

In Phase I of the State Right to Read program 185 elementary schools were involved. In Phase II over 200 are participating. Three to five representatives per school have been involved in the Right to Read staff development sessions. Therefore, it would be reasonable to assume that the growth in reading achievement scores and the increased emphasis on reading in the state was impacted by the State Right to Read effort.

NEW YORK

New York state indicates that reading is a top priority impacted upon by the Right to Read effort and other federally funded programs. They feel the Right to Read "process" is bringing about significant change by reaching the people who are operating the programs in the schools. Forty of the original forty-three districts are implementing reading improvement activities as a result of the SEA staff development training program with no additional funding. This year there are 130 districts now engaging in similar program development activities. Eight hundred representatives of these 130 districts are participating in the training sessions.

Using 1966 date as base line data New York State finds that third grade achievement has been reversed, with highly significant differences in the large cities where the emphasis has been directed. For four years the steadily decreasing achievement scores showed there was an increase in the numbers of those not meeting success in reading. Last year this began turning around. This year there was a 2 percent improvement of the state third grade population scores. In New York City it was an 8 percent improvement.

At the intermediate grade level the trend from 1966 was a steady downhill. For the last two years there has been no decrease. It seems to be leveling off. With the greater number of reading improvement activities because of Right to Read it is forecast that this trend will soon be upward.

OREGON

Statewide assessment at the fourth grade level on a sampling basis of 8,000 students in the state of Oregon indicated growth in reading.

The districts in the eastern part of the state are almost completely Right to Read. It was found that these areas are getting highly positive results because they are diagnosing correctly and those diagnosed are receiving more help. The state Right to Read office has worked more closely with that area then with any other part of the state.

Last year 125 out of 350 districts in the state were Right to Read districts. This year there are over 200. Statistical data from two Right to Read districts is presented:

Year	Grades	Total number students	Total number schools	Months gain
1974–75	3			2
1974–75	5			2
1974–75	6			3
Total		300	3	

The Stanford Achievement Test was used.

Thirty-three hundred students from seventeen schools tested on the Stanford Achievement Test in 1974–75 at grades 1, 2, 4, and 8 made overall average gains of six months. In every case achievement was higher.

GEORGIA

Statewide testing data from the state of Georgia presents a composite of twelve Right to Read Districts. Mean growth in standard scores from school year 1973–74 to school year 1974–75 is as follows:

Grades and test used	Number of schools	Mean growth
4—Iowa test of basic skills	32	1.23
8—Iowa test of basic skills	13	1.23
11—Test of academic progress	9	.18

One of the twelve districts reported a comparison of data.

Year of testing	Grades	Test used	Number of students	Growth for 9 mo. of instruction
1969	1 to 8	CAT[1]	400	6 mo.
1974–75	1 to 8	CAT	400	1 year 2 mo.

[1] California achievement test.

NEW JERSEY

In its evaluation report of the New Jersey Right to Read Program through August 31, 1974, the SEA Right to Read Director makes the following statement.

Right to Read procedures are being used as a model for school districts to follow in developing a system to facilitate educational change. Recent state legislation has mandated the State Department to create such a vehicle. This is called "Thorough and Efficient" in New Jersey. Right to Read staff members are playing an important role in this major undertaking.

No recent data is available to indicate the effects of this effort.

NEW ENGLAND CONSORTIUM

Included is an evaluation of the New England Consortium for the Right to Read. This report gives a general overview of the impact of the SEA Right to Read effort and reflects the picture presented by other state Right to Read programs.

The New England Consortium is comprised of the following states: Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Connecticut and Rhode Island.

CENTER FOR FIELD RESEARCH AND SCHOOL SERVICES AT BOSTON COLLEGE

Progress Report of the First Year Efforts of the New England Consortium for the Right To Read, 1973–1974

Impact of the New England Consortium program: The most important evaluative aspect of the Consortium training sessions relates to the impact or what happened as a result of these four training sessions. The following list presents comments made by LEA directors as to the impact Right to Read training had on their school's reading program and on them personally.

Those things brought about in LEA reading programs as a result of Right to Read:

1. Reading Specialists
    a. Secondary reading specialists have redefined their roles to provide in-service information.
    b. Heightened expectancy for productivity from the reading specialists.
2. Continuous Progress
    a. Effort to provide a continuous progress reading program.
    b. Continuous progress 1–6 skills guideline in all schools and practicing individualization on a continuous progress skills continuum.

c. Teachers are more aware of the importance of skill development.

3. Teachers
   a. Teachers are more committed to reading.
   b. Content area teachers are asking for help.
   c. Junior high teachers are now attending elementary curriculum meetings to better understand their program.
4. Communication
   a. Teachers, for first time, at various levels have communicated with each other and with administrators. They view each other more as equals while moving toward a common goal.
   b. Representation of teachers from different levels (primary, intermediate, and junior high) getting together for discussion of strengths, weaknesses and how they can work together—improved communication.
   c. The resources which have become available through contacts within the Consortium group have enabled better provisions for district in-service programs.
5. Needs Assessment and Evaluation
   a. The needs assessment:
      i. clearly identified district reading needs.
      ii. clearly defined directions for future in-service development, K–12.
      iii. through assessing needs and determining priorities, stating and planning for accomplishment of goals are more important now.
   b. Children read more and appear to really enjoy it.
   c. Reading scores have improved.
   d. More individualizing of instruction.
   e. Some criterion-referenced testing.
   f. Formal evaluation of total school system in reading.
6. Community Involvement
   a. Effort being put into bridging the gap between the community and the school.
   b. Atmosphere and community relationships have improved: i.e., librarians share materials and ideas, and parents are more at ease and are more welcome in the schools.
   c. Made more people aware of the Right to Read program and the need for community involvement.
   d. Promotional efforts have taken place through the media.
   e. Citizens Council in operation.
   f. Very strong Advisory Council and Task Force which will share a responsibility for publicizing the Right to Read effort.
   g. Group of trained volunteers directly a result of Right to Read.
7. Personal Reactions
   a. Given me the confidence and the courage needed to implement and follow through on the priorities derived from needs assessment.
   b. I involve more people in planning and think more carefully about reading evaluation and goals for my district.
   c. I find it easier to work with groups who represent the community as well as other staff members.
   d. Scientific approach to meetings and to curriculum in general.
   e. Now assume the role of program development at secondary level, formerly my assignment was limited to the elementary level.
   f. Feel that we now have our "foot in the door" at the Junior and Senior High.
   g. Feel as though the ground work has been laid and that this coming school year changes in attitudes and practices will take hold for both teachers and parents.
8. Planned Programs
   a. Training Literacy Volunteers in community in Fall.
   b. Working on program for parents of pre-schoolers.
   c. In-service being planned for teachers in the content areas.
   d. Some in-service work is planned for Fall '74 that I feel is due to the work of Right to Read.

The impact of specific training sessions were also cited by LEA directors. The impact of the Summer session was the RUPS brainstorming procedures. The techniques provided skills in anticipating and planning for alternative outcomes when designing action plans for solutions to reading problems.

COLORADO SEA

State effort

I. LEA Involvement and SEA Training[1] *Session*

Phase I—1973–74, 10 districts, 7 sessions.
Phase II—1974–75, 11 districts, 7 sessions.
Phase III—1975–76, 10 districts (1 adult high school), 6 sessions.
Percent of teachers involved=43 percent.
Percent students involved=43 percent.
Evaluation of effectiveness of training sessions: 3.0–3.5 on a 4.0 scale.

II. Additional SEA Activities

A. Published Monthly Newsletter from 1973–74.
  1. 9 issues per school year.
  2. Circulation=Expanded from 2,000–4,500 throughout state.
  3. For the past three years the Colorado IRA has provided a two page insert which describes the reading activities of local reading councils.
B. *Colorado Right to Read Day*
  1. Governor has isued a proclamation for the past three years.
  2. Held third week of October each year.
  3. Receives local television and newspaper coverage for Right to Read.
  4. Radio Spots recorded by chairperson of Advisory Council and distributed to 50 radio stations throughout the state.
C. Established a consultant bank to be utilized by LEAs.
D. Clearinghouse of reading information and resources. Receives 25 requests per month.
E. Coordination:
  1. Institutions of Higher Education
    A. Contacted all IHEs in State
    B. Direct involvement of IHEs
      1. 5 state universities and their extensions
      2. 4 state colleges
      3. 2 private college and universities
      4. 5 community jr. colleges
      5. 1 Reading Specialist from each university and college
  2. Right to Read representation on executive Board of Colorado IRA.
  3. Right to Read initiator and member of Colorado Book Award Committee.
  4. Speaker at State Reading Conferences and local IRA conferences.
  5. Questions about Right to Read on University Comprehension exams.
  6. Commissioner of Education has received numerous letters recognizing success in LEA communities.

III. Local Inservice and LEA Involvement

A. Statistical Data 1974–75.
  1. 21 districts
  2. 285 inservice sessions
  3. 13,125 participants including teachers, administrators, volunteers, parents, aides, students.
  4. School year 1975–76.
    A. 31 districts.
    B. 34 sessions of inservice.
    C. 3,101 participants.
    D. ⅓ of sessions received college credit.
    E. Evaluation of local inservice: 3.25–3.75 on 4.0 scale.
B. Accomplishments of each district
  1. Board resolution.
  2. Appointment of LEA/R2R Advisory Council.
  3. Assessment of district needs.
  4. Development of plans of action.
  5. Inservice training—Pre-school, elementary, secondary, and parents.
  6. 12 of 21 districts emphasis on secondary education.
C. Major Developments
  1. 4 districts created secondary content area teams of teachers will conduct on-going in-service in the district.

---

[1] Session (1)=2–3 days

2. Coordination with libraries to provide inservice for pre-school mothers.
3. 1 LEA is training tutors to work in jail being built.
4. 1 LEA is training volunteers to work with Boys Clubs of America.
5. 10 out of 21 LEAs have adopted USSR in elementary and secondary schools.
6. 4 districts have developed content area kits which have been shared with others.
7. 10 Districts distribute Parent reading pamphlets ranging from preschool through secondary.
8. 90% of LEAs publish LEA Reading Newsletter.
9. 50% of LEAs received extensive media coverage.

STATEMENT OF HON. TERREL H. BELL, U.S. COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE; ACCOMPANIED BY DR. ANDREW PORTER, ACTING ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, BASIC SKILLS GROUP, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION; DR. CHARLES D. SHIPMAN, ACTING DIRECTOR, RIGHT TO READ PROGRAM, U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION; RICHARD A. HASTINGS, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR LEGISLATION (EDUCATION), DHEW; AND DR. ALBERT L. ALFORD, ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR LEGISLATION, OE

Dr. BELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Quie?

Mr. QUIE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Of all the things that a child learns in school, reading is the most important. In fact, I have always thought that if we taught them to read, they could probably educate themselves. However, if they can't read, it is pretty hard to even secure an education from a formal education program.

We have known for a long time that children have gone through the education system and not learned how to read. It was under the Kennedy administration, I think, that the study was made by the Department of Defense, the Department of Labor, and the Department of HEW, indicating that one-third of the students who came out of our educational system in this country could not pass a preinduction mental examination, which is about the equivalent of the seventh grade.

Since then, progress has been made. While I am critical of the school's inability to help people to read, I want to say at the same time that a great deal has been learned. When I look at the progress that the Office of Education has made and that which the schools have made, it does not give me cause to be pessimistic but rather gives me cause to be optimistic.

When I look at what the State of Minnesota has done, and many other schools and the Office of Education, I can see tremendous progress. So with that, Commissioner Bell, I commend you and those who are with you.

Mr. ZEFERETTI. Dr. Bell, will you proceed?

Dr. BELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have with me here some colleagues who will help to respond to questions. Perhaps to save time we can introduce them as we proceed with the testimony.

But I would like to introduce the four branch chiefs in the Right to Read program, if they would stand, please. They are in the first row behind me. Many of them are new to the Office of Education, and this will be their first time at a hearing. So I particularly wanted to introduce them to the committee.

I appreciate the invitation to appear before you to deliver a condensed statement which summarizes a much more detailed presentation of our desire to inform you of developments in the Right to Read effort and to express as strongly as possible our interest in your advancing the amendments contained in H.R. 8304 through the legislative process. I would like to leave an unabridged version of our response for you to include in the record or for you to otherwise use as you see fit.

In recent weeks, we have heard a great deal about the decline of test scores and other testing results which have many inferences for reading competence among our youth and adults. Upon a close analysis of the various information available to us in these matters, it appears that in the early years of schooling, the decline in test scores is not as severe as elsewhere in the kindergarten through grade 12 structure.

I might also add that there have been some actual increases in test scores as well as declines. It is not all bad news by any means.

This may be some indication that the Right to Read and similar efforts are beginning to have an impact across the country. Dr. Porter of the National Institute of Education is with me today to discuss the test score phenomenon in more detail. Therefore, I shall not dwell upon it further.

Most all of us will agree that increasing our competence in reading and the related skills continues to be a worthwhile proposition for pursuit across the Nation. The right to read activity in our office has since 1970 initiated a number of successful and worthy projects which added together have made noteworthy contributions toward the improvement of reading instruction. One of the contributions has been to raise the level of awareness among our citizenry of the need to vigorously pursue improvements in our procedures and processes of developing the reading skills. Another has been to advocate a desire to read widely and effectively among our students and adults. Right to Read has served as a catalytic agent in influencing the allocation of other resources throughout the Education Division to assist in attacking the reading problem.

The activity under the right to read objective in our agency breaks down into a series of logically planned and related projects. A total of 342 individual projects have been funded to date. Most of these were for a 2- or 3-year period. Those currently in the final year of funding are described in the statement which follows.

The State leadership program represents one of those which has been quite successful. This activity supports a triad of agencies working cooperatively on a statewide basis to overcome deficiencies in the teaching and learning of reading skills. State educational agencies, local school districts, and the institutions of higher education should collectively marshal their forces for the improvement of reading. The State educational agency must assume the leadership role in achieving this cooperative working arrangement. This is primarily a training initiative provided as inservice education for teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals, librarians, and other reading personnel.

The second category of program activity under the Right to Read label is a series of 21 reading improvement projects operating in 19 States to improve reading-related competencies.

Another facet of the Right to Read effort is to establish reading academies. A reading academy is a resource center which is available to assist any and all elements of a communitywide program designed to improve reading skills of out-of-school youth and adults. Twenty projects for reading academies have been supported in 17 States.

Another category of support for reading has been labeled the national impact programs. This represents a series of rather small projects, some of which use TV as a medium of instruction and others are directed at the research and developmental functions of coping with the reading problem. The activities supported under the national impact programs are designed to give widespread benefit at a relatively low per capita cost. Finally, the program also provides support for special emphasis types of projects and for reforming teacher-training programs for preparing better teachers.

We have at this point reached a milestone in the overall Right to Read effort. Thus far, the program components have included the demonstration programs for inschool children, adult reading programs, the State leadership programs, and the national impact thrusts. All of these programs are in their final year of funding and will be completed this year. Title VII, Public Law 93–380, provides for the continuation of only two of these previous program components: the reading improvement projects for preschool and elementary children, and the reading academies for adults. Activities for which we expended 77 percent of our funds in fiscal year 1975 cannot be continued under the new law. If the other essential components of the overall effort are to be continued—namely, the State leadership program and the national impact thrust—the amendments contained in H.R. 8304 must be passed.

Finally, before asking Dr. Porter to review the NIE findings on declining test scores and related information, I would like to make a brief observation concerning H.R. 9048, a bill before you to amend title VII of Public Law 93–380 to permit the distribution of inexpensive books to be used in the teaching of reading. Certainly the provisions of the bill are desirable from an educational point of view. However, we do not feel it appropriate for the Federal Government to assume responsibility for an activity which has achieved considerable support and success in the private sector. Moreover, we would prefer to apply the limited resources which title VII provides to continuing the efforts which we have outlined in this testimony.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I again want to express our appreciation for the invitation to appear before your subcommittee this morning. I hope that you will concur that we desperately need the amendments provided in H.R. 8304, in order that our forward progress not be halted, in overcoming severe reading problems across the Nation.

Dr. Porter will now share some of his insights on test scores and related matters with you.

Dr. PORTER. Thank you, Dr. Bell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is a pleasure to participate in these hearings which address the very important topic of efforts to improve the reading skills of all members of our society. In that regard, I have been asked to comment specifically on some of the standardized test score results which, taken collectively, have come to be called the test score decline phenomenon. With the committee's permission, I would like to submit a longer piece of testimony for the record.

[Prepared statement of Dr. Porter follows:]

Prepared Statement of Dr. Andrew Porter (Acting), Associate Director for Basic Skills, National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Over the past several months, increasingly greater attention has been given to a phenomenon labeled test score decline. Most of that attention has focused on two tests of scholastic aptitude, but results of achievement tests are creating some stir as well. It is now apparent that a wealth of data is available for assessing the extent of decline across a variety of populations and content areas. Unfortunately these data sources remain largely unused for this purpose, a situation which NIE and other agencies are moving to correct. Since the Right to Read Program was created to improve reading skills in our country and because reading skills are an integral part of most other formal learning, a brief summary of the test score decline follows. The summary is primarily based on data from the following tests:

—Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)—Verbal and Mathematics tests for 11th and 12 grades
—American College Testing (ACT)—English, Mathematics, Social Studies and Natural Science tests for 11th and 12th grades
—National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)—Science and Reading tests for 9, 13, 17 years olds and young adults
—Iowa Test for Educational Development (ITED)—Tests of ten subjects for grades 9–12
—Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)—Vocabulary, Reading, Language Skills and Mathematics tests for grades 1–8

During the 1940's and 1950's and into the early 60's, standardized test scores were, on the average, improving at all grade levels and in all subjects. In the mid-1960's, however, the average scores reached a peak and then started to decline. This decline, which has been steepest at the secondary school level, cannot be dismissed as trivial. For example, on a scale of 200–800 the average verbal SAT score has dropped 39 points (from 473 to 434) since 1966–67; ten points of that drop occurred last year. To be sure, there are some inconsistencies in the decline. For example, while the verbal subscores of the SAT, ACT, ITED and ITBS all showed declines at the secondary school level, a special NAEP test of basic reading performance among seventeen year olds showed a modest increase. Also at the secondary level, NAEP and ITED tests of science showed a decline whereas the ACT scores of natural science held steady. Another important inconsistency occurs in the early grades (K–3) where the decline does not seem to be present.

I. DETAILS FOR COLLEGE BOUND HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS

A. SAT

Verbal scores peaked in 1963, and declined through 1975. While females used to score higher than males, they now score below and are dropping faster. Mathematics scores also peaked in 1963 but have dropped more slowly than Verbal scores through 1975 with the same decline for both sexes.

B. ACT

Both English and Mathematics scores for the ACT have profiles similar to that of SAT Mathematics. In contrast, the Social Science scores show a relatively steeper decline and (as stated above) the Natural Science scores have showed no change since 1963. Interestingly, the Social Sciences test has been judged by some to be more similar in content to the SAT Verbal than is the ACT English test. If so, this information may explain why the ACT English scores have not dropped as fast as the SAT Verbal.

II. DETAILS FOR COLLEGE BOUND 11TH GRADERS

Another version of the SAT tests, the PSAT, is taken by many college bound students when they are juniors in high school. Curiously, these scores have not consistently declined since the mid-1960's. The reason is perhaps that these tests are used for special purposes, such as to select National Merit Scholars, and therefore might attract a different and more highly motivated population of test-takers.

III. DETAILS FOR OTHER GRADES

It is more difficult to describe the test score decline for grades K–10 since there are no national testing programs at these levels except for NAEP, which will be considered later. Several experts with access to a variety of data have informally suggested that there may not be a decline in the early grades, but that around grade four the decline begins and becomes progressively steeper at each higher grade level. Again the decline appears to have started in the mid-1960's.

Data from the State of Iowa, which are available on all grades from the early 1960's, agree with the pattern of no decline in the early grades and increasing decline in later grades. If this pattern holds generally, it is of interest and possibly relevant to past efforts to improve reading skills. The reason is that it is on the early grades where scores are not declining that most Federal educational interventions have focused. Moreover, in the early grades the teaching of reading is limited primarily to word recognition, while in fourth grade the reading curriculum switches to an emphasis on reading for comprehension.

IV. DETAILS ON NAEP

Thus far, all data mentioned pertain to special populations, e.g., the college bound or students in just one State. A key strength of the NAEP data is that it is based on nationally representative samples. Ultimately, NAEP will have data across 10 subjects, typically with four years between each testing for a subject. To date, reports are available for one retesting in science and a special retesting in basic reading performance. The first testing of reading was in 1971; the second takes place this year with the results planned to be available in late Spring or early Summer.

The NAEP Science scores produced a familiar pattern, a decline which increases at the higher age levels (however, it should be noted that in this case the interval between test dates was not the same at each age level). Encouragingly, the basic reading performance scores were up slightly over the testing period 1971–74, but the sample was limited to 17 year olds.

V. EXPLANATIONS

The following are factors which might bear on the decline, but which have not been systematically analyzed yet.

A. Changes in the composition of groups taking the tests

The mobility of families with school age children has been increasing since the early 1960's.

The population of college-bound students has changed, especially with respect to the proportion students from groups with relatively lower scores in the past, including minorities and women.

B. Institutional changes

Starting in the early 1960's, there has been a proliferation of curricula, especially for the secondary schools.

Federal funding (e.g., Title I, Follow Through, Head Start), which began in the early 1960's, has focused on the early grades, not on the higher levels.

Secondary school statistics show that students are taking fewer courses than they used to take. (The Pattern of Course Offerings and Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, 1970–71, NCES, 1974).

C. Measurement problems

The pool of test items for standardized tests has remained relatively constant whereas curricula have been changing.

There may be technical problems with the equating procedures which have been used to link different forms of the same tests from year to year.

D Cultural changes

Cultural changes appear to have been taking place at the same time as the decline—for example, in student motivation, societal attitudes about competition and increasing amounts of time spent in non-school activities (e.g., expanded TV watching, access to automobiles, and more outside/family activities).

School desegregation in general has increased over this period. But it has increased most in the South where there has been the least score decline. In the North, where desegregation has remained relatively stable, there has been the greatest score decline. (*The Condition of Education*, NCES).

Drug use and anti-war activities have appeared as national movements.

The students responsible for the declining test scores are of "Baby-boom" age. These students have lived through educational disruptions, expanding facilities, teacher shortages, new teachers, and other administrative reorganizations.

Conclusion

The information on score decline is currently inconclusive. It is derived from data averaged over whole groups of students. It is quite possible that over the period of general decline, the average score of some groups of students has been increasing. In ascribing cause or in explaining changes, it is important to separate causes which can affect particular groups from causes which might contribute to the overall decline.

Dr. PORTER. Most of the public attention has focused on two tests of general scholastic aptitude taken by college-bound secondary school students, the SAT and the ACT. During the 1940's and 1950's and into the early 1960's average scores on these tests were improving. But in the mid-1960's, the increase reached a peak, and the average scores started into the present decline.

As fas as Right to Read is concerned, these aptitude data seem to be of only tangential interest. First, aptitude tests are constructed to be relatively insensitive to the effects of educational interventions, such as Right to Read. Second, the students who take these tests are among the Nation's most proficient readers.

There is, however, not only aptitude data but a wealth of achievement data available for assessing the extent of test score decline across a variety of populations and subject areas. Although, to date, these disparate data sources have not been well synthesized to yield the desired national profiles on achievement, the NIE and others are moving to correct this deficiency. An initial NIE report should be available within the next several months.

One of the potentially most interesting data sources for understanding test score decline is the national assessment of educational progress inasmuch as it tests nationally representative samples. Ultimately, NAEP will have data available across 10 subject areas, typically with 4 years between testing.

To date, from their regular testing program, only the science results are available for longitudinal data and they show a modest decline for samples of 9-, 13-, and 17-year-olds tested first about 1969 and again in 1973. The decline is about 2 percent.

In contrast, a special NAEP testing of 17-year-olds on basic reading performance in 1971 and again in 1974—funded incidentally by right to read—showed a modest increase in average scores. The regular NAEP testing of readings skills was given in 1971 and results from the second testing in this area will be available late spring or early summer of the coming year.

The results from the special NAEP test of basic reading performance are not the only results inconsistent with the general patterns of declining test scores. Several experts with access to longitudinal achievement data have informally suggested a very interesting pattern of test score averages across grade levels. Briefly, there does not seem to be a decline until grade 4 and then the decline becomes progressively steeper for each higher grade level.

We have been able to find this same pattern quite clearly in data available since the early 1960's on statewide samples in Iowa. If the pattern holds generally, it is of interest and possibly relevant to past and future efforts to improve reading skills. The reason is, first, that it is on the early grades, where scores are not declining, that the bulk of Federal educational interventions have focused. Second, in the early grades the teaching of reading is typically limited primarily to work recognition whereas in the fourth grade the usual reading curriculum switches to an emphasis on reading for comprehension.

Another type of data, while not addressing the question of test score decline, does speak to the need for continued and possibly stronger efforts in programs aimed at teaching reading. A recent OE-supported study done at the University of Texas concluded that approximately 22 percent of the nation's adults have unsatisfactory reading skills. I might add that this figure seem consistent with the earlier Harris poll that was cited by Dr. Bell.

In contrast the NAEP special testing of basic reading performance estimated 11 percent of the Nation's 17-year-olds as functional illiterate. The difference in percentages may be real or explained by the differences in population tested, that is, the adult population has had relatively less access to schooling than the 17-year-old population and/or the different definitions of functional literacy. These definitions have not been tied one to another as yet.

There is, of course, an interesting array of hypothesized causes for the test score decline, all of which are yet to be tested in any convincing way. These causes can be categorized as:

(1) Changes in the composition of groups taking the tests, for example, increasing school dropout rates.

(2) Institutional changes, for example, the proliferation of new curricula, especially in the secondary schools.

(3) Measurement problems, for example, items making up standardized tests have remained fairly much the same and so may be out of date with the goals of schooling.

(4) Cultural changes, for example, declines in student motivation or increased time watching television.

In conclusion, it should be noted that the information on test score decline is derived from data averaged over whole groups of students. It is quite possible that over the period of general decline, some subgroups of students have shown increases.

Thank you.

Chairman Perkins. Dr. Bell, do you have any further comments, or do any of your assistants?

Dr. Bell. No; I don't believe we have, Mr. Chairman. I would be happy to respond to any questions you might want to raise.

Chairman Perkins. Mr. Quie?

Mr. Quie. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

How long does your authority for your Right to Read program continue?

Dr. **Bell.** It is through 1978 plus the automatic extension. So actually 1979, if we took the extension into consideration.

Mr. **Quie.** You have authority to deal with the States directly through 1978?

Dr. **Bell.** We don't have that. That is part of our proposed amendment.

Mr. **Quie.** When does that expire?

Dr. **Bell.** The authority to deal with the States?

Mr. **Quie.** Yes.

Dr. **Bell.** It has expired. We don't have that authority now, as I understand it.

Dr. **Alford.** My understanding, Mr. Quie, is that the new law takes precedence until we got amendments and we would not be able to do it this year.

Mr. **Quie.** So at this present time you are not able to do it?

Dr. **Alford.** Yes; right now States are operating on money carried over from fiscal year 1975. We couldn't renew these grants.

Mr. **Quie.** So you are presently out of authority?

Dr. **Alford.** That is right.

Mr. **Quie.** If you are going to have any continuation of contracts you have now will we need new authorization legislation?

Dr. **Bell.** That is right. That is why it is so urgent and why we have been emphasizing this so heavily.

Mr. **Quie.** I would think, Mr. Chairman, there would be such little controversy on something like the reading programs, that perhaps you could run something like this right through on suspension and it would be accepted.

Chairman **Perkins.** I would think so, too. I think we should get the bill out and put it under suspension so you will have the authority.

Mr. **Quie.** Dr. Bell, have you got any figure that would indicate increases in achievement level because of the State program you mentioned?

Dr. **Bell.** I would ask Dr. Shipman to respond to that, if he will. He is the acting director of the Right to Read program.

Dr. **Shipman.** Yes; Mr. Quie. Some of the States were funded 4 years ago. The final 19 were funded in fiscal year 1975. Those States have had the responsibility of conducting an assessment of needs in reading throughout the States and in providing leadership training for local Right to Read directors. Approximately 3,200 of the 16,000 districts have been reached now among the States to help prepare administrative personnel for Right to Read programs within those districts.

Mr. **Quie.** Where they do have programs in districts, have they now indicated pretest and postest reading level changes?

Dr. **Shipman.** Actually most of those programs are just getting under way. The pretesting has been done.

Mr. **Quie.** So there hasn't been any posttesting?

Dr. **Shipman.** We don't have statistics to indicate success except in some isolated cases for districts that have reported to us. But we have no overall comprehensive review of that.

Mr. QUIE. Do you have an indication from those isolated cases?

Dr. SHIPMAN. Yes; we do. It is very positive. The evaluation of 44 of those programs that were funded in 1972 shows that the average gain was 1 month of growth for each 1 month of instruction, which of course is what we are working toward.

Mr. QUIE. To some people, 1 month of growth for 1 month of instruction may not look very good. But from looking at the problems that exist and the growth that would have occurred without this program, this is really spectacular.

Dr. SHIPMAN. Yes, it is. We thought it was a very positive evaluation of the results. We think if we could achieve that kind of growth in our overall activities in our educational system that we would be doing well. Remember we are talking about children who without reading assistance are progressively falling more behind rather than increasing their reading abilities.

Mr. QUIE. Do you think you have the capability of determining what it is that causes some students to have achievement growth so much greater than the average and why some students have so very little, or in fact are back where they were before?

Dr. SHIPMAN. I think, sir, there is research into that point. I think one of the most successful ways to achieve reading growth, and is the major emphasis of the Right to Read thrust, is to approach the teaching of reading from the diagnostic prescriptive approach, which means attempting to diagnose individual needs and then prescribing a program specifically designed to meet those identified needs.

That is quite different from providing the same kind of reading experiences.

Dr. BELL. I would just like to add a point there, if I may, Mr. Quie. In observing reading scores in large school systems it is interesting to note that they correlate closely with what we think are home factors, the income level and the education level of the parents.

In the school system that I left when I came to this position we had 53 elementary schools. We were able to rank those schools by the census data, on the income level and the educational level of the parents as reported from the census data. There was a very high correlation in those rankings, when we ranked them according to test scores. This indicates that the home has an enormous impact upon learning.

I say that to indicate that first of all schools need to assume much of the responsibility or much of the blame for declining test scores. I don't want to say it isn't a prime mission and a prime responsibility of the schools because it is.

But I would say that the possibility of the schools accomplishing their mission is greatly hampered by what I think is a decline of the home and the quality of the out-of-school environment for children.

Our information shows that 1 million school children a year are touched by divorce. This affects youngsters emotionally in ways that I think affect their achievement. The overall indulgence of society right now and particularly the almost nationwide epidemic that we have with alcohol and drug problems is having, in my own view, some influence upon the scores that we see in the teenage scholastic aptitude scores at the present time.

Today the 17-year-old spends 12,000 hours of his academic life in the classroom but has spent 15,000 hours viewing television. This may have some impact upon this, the fact that many parents both have to work to make it in this inflationary economy that we have.

The point I am trying to make is that all these factors can either enhance or make the schools' problems more difficult.

When persons ask me why scores are declining and why schools aren't doing better I have to emphasize that schools are a reflection of the society in which they live and the neighborhood and the community that they serve.

I come back again to what I said, that schools need to shoulder a considerable portion of the responsibility and the blame for decline in these test scores. But I would also emphasize these other factors that I am talking about. I think they have a very profound influence upon education in general.

Mr. QUIE. To what extent have the models that are developed that you feel should be replicated in the schools around the Nation become a part of what you call the national diffusion network? The national diffusion people who work in Minnesota come and talk with me about this. I am kind of excited about what is happening now in speeding up the replication of good, innovative demonstration programs.

Dr. BELL. I think most of those programs are in reading. One of the concerns that we have is that the State departments continue these national diffusion networks. We have been funding that through the Commissioner's setaside with the old title III of ESEA. As you know, that all now goes to the States. We are hoping to encourage and continue that support in the exercise of their discretion.

But most of the programs that are being diffused under that network are programs in the reading areas. This has been our prime area of concentration.

In that regard I might indicate, Mr. Quie, that we are trying hard to call more attention to the more successful compensatory education programs under title I of ESEA. As you know we have had 10 years of experience now under title I where reading activities are conducted more extensively than any other, which is as it should be.

We have found some unusual successes in some areas. I would have to say we have found some spectacular failures in the process.

One of the leadership responsibilities that I am constantly emphassizing at OE is that we need to spread the information and do all that we can to influence the schools to implement these programs that stand out by the remarkable success that some of them have had. There are a few that do that in a very dramatic way.

Some of the funding that we now have for dissemination in program packaging, we are going to try to utilize some of that out of this fiscal year's budget. We have about $3 million for that purpose. I don't know how responsive that is to the question.

Mr. QUIE. That gives me an idea on it. Are you optimistic about the States using the title III money now for their portion of the national diffusion network?

Dr. BELL. I am a bit apprehensive about that. It is a program that the Federal Government started. It may be difficult to persuade all the States to do that. As I talk to my staff I have some worry about that, Mr. Quie.

Mr. **Quie.** Just one last question, Dr. Bell. From your comments on the distribution of books in your testimony on this bill, I gather that you support the concept of distributing inexpensive books to school children?

Dr. **Bell.** Yes; in fact we made a small grant to the Reading Is Fundamental organization under discretionary funds that I had last year, about an $80,000 grant. It is the policy of this administration under the present tight framework to avoid taking further obligations, particularly in programs that can be increased in their dollar amounts.

So in keeping with that policy, the administration has expressed opposition to this particular program.

Mr. **Quie.** I respect that decision. However, if we were going to place money into this program, what is your view of the structure of the legislation? I hope I don't cause you problems by asking the question.

Dr. **Bell.** I think if we were going to do that—and by responding to that I don't in any way want to imply that the administration is in support of this—that the structure is a good one.

Chairman **Perkins.** Mrs. Chisholm?

Mrs. **Chisholm.** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have so many questions.

First of all, I think it is important for us to look ahead to the remedies for the reading difficulties that are faced by so many children and adults in this Nation. You have noted that environment and home factors have a great deal to do with reading achievement and the reading level. If a child is not exposed to a reading environment that is a negative thing in and of itself.

There are a number of people who do not come from impoverished environments and yet they are not able to read and comprehend. It seems to me that this has to do with the quality of teacher training that is going on in our institutions. It is my understanding that there is very little special reading instruction for teachers in the elementary school situations. The teachers just take one or two courses at the undergraduate institutions.

It seems to me that we have to restructure the entire educational system insofar as this negative impact exists which will have an effect on this Nation for years to come. It isn't a question of money alone. Many of us think and believe that money can do everything. But it is not money. I think we have to look at the entire reading program. What is your reaction to that?

Dr. **Bell.** Yes; I agree with the point that I don't think we are doing as good a job as we ought to in teaching teachers how to teach reading. As I talk to teachers that I respect for their competence, most of them have told me that they have learned to teach reading through trial and error on the job.

I think that of all the areas of teacher preparation that this is an area that really needs improvement. One of the problems in this area as you well know is that we are not having openings for large numbers of new teachers to enter into the field because of declining enrollments.

I think the big challenge now is in-service training and preparation of teachers, to use some of the newer materials and methods and approaches that are available. I think we know a lot more about how to teach reading than is practiced in the school. It is a little like the farmer who says, "No need to go to agricultural college. I already know how to farm better than I do." I think we know how to teach reading a lot better than the prevailing practices.

I agree with that point very much. I think we ought to be doing a much more aggressive job in that connection. I might just indicate that a consortium of representatives from some State departments of education are working toward what they call "competency-based teacher education" where they actually expect demonstrated competency as a prerequisite to certification of the teacher. I see a great interest in that recently. If we move in that direction I think we are going to be more results oriented.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you. Two more questions. They are rather lengthy. Dr. Bell, you or any member of your panel may answer the question. Some educators have suggested to me that standardized reading scores tend to exaggerate the reading ability of students. For example, I have been told that in a typical standardized reading test administered to fourth graders no child in the class will score below first grade level even though, in fact, there may be nonreaders in the group.

It is my understanding that this results from the fact that at the fourth grade level the paper on which all of the answers are marked incorrectly the grade levels are measured at primer or above.

Would you comment on this and whether you feel this is an accurate description of how reading tests are evaluated and scored?

Dr. BELL. The particular problem with the example at the fourth grade level relates to the fact that the testing packages from most of the what we call the big seven in test publishing the testing packages are broken up into parts. We have the primary grade, which is kindergarten through third grade and then the next group is fourth, fifth and, sixth grade. So a fourth grader who is taking that test, the test assumes a certain reading level. They don't bring it down to where it measures the nonreading or very marginal reading functions that you would see with extremely retarded first-grade level readers.

So I think the test in that regard gives the student more credit. I think that explains that phenomenon.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. The second part to my question then would be that we know there are children in the public schools who cannot read sufficiently to fill out the instructions on the standardized reading test. Many of them will fill out the questions on the test whether or not they really comprehend the questions that are being asked. If this is possible, it would seem to me, again, that the test results are further being distorted.

Dr. BELL. Yes; Dr. Porter wanted to respond a moment ago. Before I call on Dr. Porter to respond to the problem of obtaining a measuring instrument that can measure these capabilities I don't think it can be overemphasized. I understand you are going to have some test experts in this hearing who will be able to respond more effectively. The problem that the test-maker has is having a limited number of test items at the same time they try to measure many, many complex factors.

We are constantly getting these questions about whether the yardstick is like it ought to be.

Voltaire wrote a book that was criticized by many. He said, "Oh, well, when a head comes in contact with a book and a hollow sound is emitted it isn't always the book."

I would say we are always going to find deficiencies in the measuring instruments. But I think that out of all those we have the areas of reading and mathematics we have the best means of measuring. We may miss individual students. But when we sample an entire school or an entire school district or State school system I think we are getting a fairly broad representative appraisal, an assessment of what is there.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Buchanan?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. QUIE. Before we go ahead, there was another comment.

Dr. SHIPMAN. I just wanted to make a couple of comments to Mrs. Chisholm's questions. To go back to teacher preparation, if I might, it seems to me that this is a very significant part of the total effort of education and certainly in reading as well. We have had over the past 2 years 34 teacher preparation programs in which we are attempting to develop models for preparing elementary teachers. Specifically, it is felt that they will cover the teaching of reading more effectively than has been done. Those programs are in their terminal year now. We hope to be able to identify the successful models and to disseminate those throughout the Nation. That is where we need the national impact amendment.

Second, it seems to me that one of the things that is really a major concern here in our overall education effort is the fact that each of the States basically has three major agencies that are supported by taxes for accomplishment of education in the States: the SEA, the LEA's and the teacher preparation institutions. Without the combined and the coordinated effort of those three agencies it seems to me that we will never accomplish any kind of achievement in solving the literacy problem.

The literacy problem is a national problem. It involves every State and every aspect of every locality in the State. The State Education Agency has officially been given that responsibility. If they can provide leadership together with the LEA's and the teacher preparation institutions in a coordinated effort to solve the problem than I think we can probably make some gains. If we are making gains now it is because of this coordinated effort.

I think that is the way we are going to get changes in teacher education as well as changes in method at the local level.

So again my emphasis seems to me to be in supporting the State Education Agency and their leadership role in stimulating and facilitating and coordinating a combined effort within the States.

Mr. HASTINGS. There was one more comment.

Dr. PORTER. Thank you. I just want to add a brief note to your question about test scores and that is that in the opinion of many the concept of grade equivalent is a very difficult concept because several months' change in grade equivalent may be attributed to getting one item right on a test versus none. I think we are all aware of the criticism of standardized testing in general where standardized is meant to imply norm referencing, the notion of comparing students among themselves rather than comparing students' performance to some notion of what the teacher and society thinks is important. This has gotten us to a point where interest is developing in criterion-reference testing.

I would simply add for the record that there now exists some criterion-reference testing systems which allow teachers to select from a list of objectives which they feel are appropriate for the students they have in their classroom that year and then get a test especially made for those objectives, a pretest and then a posttest at the end of the year.

I think that this type of system supplements grade equivalents and is probably much more useful in terms of efforts that teachers need to engage in. Thank you.

Chairman **Perkins.** Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. **Buchanan.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I find myself as usual in rather total agreement with the gentlelady from New York in terms of her concern about the nature and the seriousness of this problem.

The diffeernce between us is that she pretty well knows what she is talking about, and I am an ignoramus. But it is apparent to me that we have a problem in these declining test scores of great significance and seriousness to the country. Just as any percent of unemployment, if a man has a family and can't find a job, 8 percent of unemployment is totally unacceptable. For him it is 100 percent unemployment.

For those of us who have children in elementary and secondary school and have pride in their potential, if something may be wrong that is denying them basic skills that are essential to success in life, that is a three-alarm fire.

In that connection you mention various analyses, various factors, that you find may be involved in explaining what is there. I wonder if you have looked at all at class instructional methods.

For example—if you will forgive a personal illustration—when I left a highly structured situation in elementary and secondary school to enter college, I floundered when I first experienced that new freedom in a less tightly structured situation. When I got to graduate school my first semester, I floundered again in a totally free situation where no one cared if I did anything or not.

I am of the opinion that there might be many elementary school children particularly who might be like that, who have a tough time succeeding in a free and open situation.

Let me say one thing more before you respond. I recently visited an elementary school in a very good school system in an advantaged area. Some of the children must have some inherent ability and might be achievers in life. I noticed that the reading pattern was that the children would come to the front, were given brief instructions, and then did their things individually without further instruction. I really wonder how many children thrive in that situation as well as some more structured kind of instruction. Would you comment on that aspect?

Dr. **Porter.** I can think of several comments. I will try to be brief. The first comment I would like to share is that there are many, many speculations as to the cause or several causes together of these test score declines. It is going to be very difficult to get at the causes because so many things are happening simultaneously. It is quite difficult to separate one from another. The ones that I mentioned I don't want to give any more importance to than others. There is a variety and we have not tested them systematically. We may never be certain as to whether they are a cause or not.

My feeling is that the National Institute of Education is moving in the direction that the best hope is in trying to put together complex profiles to see if there are some drops in some situations and not others.

Another approach to this problem of scoring decline are experimental efforts in educational research program evaluation and the like where there are different strategies to teaching reading and to determine how they fare relative to each other. I think the hope of getting at the cause of test score decline is better there than in trying to deal directly within the decline data itself.

Mr. **Buchanan**. I would request that if you have not taken a hard look at instructional methods, that this be done in connection with the analysis that you say is being done.

Let me call your attention to my own school system * * * the Birmingham school system. Dr. Cody noted what they had and did some testing and decided they didn't like what they saw in basic skills. Therefore, they made a recommitment to the three "R's" and determined they would make any and all changes that would be necessary to make sure that at least the children coming out of that school system had these basic skills. It appears to be paying off.

I wish you would take a hard look at instructional methods and see whether the typical school has become too free, too open, too little structured in discipline and instruction.

Dr. **Porter**. I think that is good advice. I don't want my response to imply that we aren't already moving in those directions. For example, in the follow-through program, which is a compensatory education effort you may or may not be familiar with, there are some 20 different strategies for teaching the skills generally taught in the early grades. They vary from highly structured reinforcement sorts of models with very careful monitoring of what teachers are doing to open education models with great flexibility. So there they are varying the dimensions. I won't comment on the results. That study is not completed. The final results should be out this spring.

Mr. **Buchanan**. Thank you.

Chairman **Perkins**. Any further questions? Mr. Miller or Mrs. Chisholm?

Mr. **Quie**. Mr. Chairman, one question of Dr. Porter. When you say the secondary school statistics show that students are taking fewer courses than they used to take, can you get any further on that? What kinds of things are being left out now? Does it mean that they are receiving a lesser education? What are they doing?

Dr. **Porter**. That is referring to an NCES report. I can't offer the particulars of it. Mr. Carl Maude is here. Perhaps he would comment.

Mr. **Maude**. It would appear, Mr. Quie, that the total course offering is larger. As you remember in the Conant report, "The American High School: 1960," he suggested that the course offerings of high schools could be made more diverse and that there be a comprehensive high school instead of the single small high school which could not offer as diverse a course requirement. That trend toward comprehensive high schools has happened in the last 15 years. People are taking more types of English, more types of science. It may be a notational problem that is accounting for fewer courses being chronicled as a particular kind of science course. On the other hand it may be that there may be more study halls. There may be more alternative educational experiences which we haven't developed notation for. There may be as much school time spent on instructional matters but our system of gathering data isn't growing as fast as the system is.

Another reason may be that students are taking longer, more intense, courses or spending more time intensively on a particular course and therefore the total number of courses they are taking has dropped.

I think both reasons could be teased out of the statistics. But we have not done an analysis as yet. We have just discovered the trend.

Dr. Bell. Mr. Quie, I think the reason they are not taking as many subjects, as we move back now to a six-period day you don't have as many choices in a typical secondary school. They used to have seven and eight-periods days.

For example, in the high school where I have three teenagers going now they have a 2-hour block in some subjects where they spend 2 hours on some subjects and they only have four choices after that. I think that is the reason they are not taking as many subjects.

Youngsters nowadays tend to start specializing if they are going to go into engineering. They take a greater amount of mathematics for example. They get classes in calculus. As we talk about declining test scores we have the bright, highly motivated youngster who is mastering subject matter that we never thought of teaching on the high school level just a few years ago. Calculus used to be about a second or third-year college course. It isn't uncommon to find high school seniors and even a few juniors that are into calculus. Some finish first-year calculus and beyond in high school. This may be telling you more than you want to know on that subject.

Mr. Quie. I just recall that I took calculus in high school.

Dr. Bell. There are exceptions. I would say, Mr. Quie, that that is an exception. A few years ago calculus was not even offered in many, many high schools and not just the small ones. If you studied calculus in high school I would argue that that is an exception.

Mr. Quie. If we pass this quickly, do you have money now? Or will we have to come up with an appropriation?

Dr. Bell. No, if you pass this we will fund it with the present appropriation. If you don't pass it, 77 percent of the funds that we have been funding in these areas will have to be redeployed. There are two project areas that we can't fund under the present law.

Mr. Quie. Thank you.

Dr. Bell. We could do that with the current funds.

Chairman Perkins. Thank you very much, Dr. Bell. We appreciate your testimony and that of the gentlemen who accompanied you here this morning.

Our next witness is Mr. Ed Cain, State Superintendent of Education, St. Paul, Minn.

Mr. Quie, do you want to say something about Mr. Cain?

Mr. Quie. Yes. I am pleased that Mr. Ed Cain is here with us. He is Director of Federal/State Programs for the Minnesota Department of Education. It is a pleasure to have him here today.

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection your statement will be inserted in the record and you may proceed.

[Prepared statement of Edwin E. Cain follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF EDWIN E. CAIN, DIRECTOR OF FEDERAL/STATE PROGRAMS MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I would first like to thank you for the opportunity to speak to this group.

Secondly, I would like to speak with you, this morning, about one of the most cost effective programs funded by the Federal Government. The State Right to Read Program, which has had the most far-reaching impact on the National reading problem, is about to be terminated if something cannot be done immediately.

The National Right to Read Program, authorized since 1972 under The Cooperative Research Act, was substantially amended by The Education Amendments of 1974, Public Law 93–380. Although I am sure this was not the intent of Congress, enactment of Title VII of P.L. 93–380 resulted in the termination of the State program component of the Right to Read Program as interpreted by the General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Without an amendment to this legislation, the activities carried on by 49 States and two outlying areas will end on February 28th, 1976.

In 1974, when only thirty-one states were involved in this national effort, the state agency program was able to establish Right to Read Programs in 1,287 school districts, and provided in-service training for more than 60,000 teachers. This program affects 3.7 million students both at the elementary and secondary level. This entire effort over a three year period was conducted at a cost to the Federal Government of only $5.3 million. By June, 1975, the number of school districts participating in the State Right to Read Programs have increased to more than 3,400. Each has made a commitment to reading excellence, established a plan to attain these goals, and has initiated activities to respond to program deficiencies. No other program in the history of Congress, and The Office of Education has positively affected this many teachers and students for such a small amount of money.

There is no need to review for you the reading problem in this Nation. I've heard testimony before this Subcommittee that has brought to your attention the facts that we have some 18½ million adult illiterates in this country; that one child in four leaves school with severe reading deficiencies; that of the 700,000 youngsters who drop out of school each year, 90 per cent are disabled readers; that one child in five drops out of school sometime between grade five and prior to high school graduation. I hardly need to stress the impact that this situation has on our society, the economy and the welfare of the citizens of this United States.

Since 1965 the Federal Government has taken an active role in addressing this problem. The passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and its amendments have directed billion of dollars towards educational needs, many of those dollars used to fund programs addressing the reading problem. Dropout prevention programs, bilingual education and many demonstration projects are also directly attuned to the reading needs of our students. Inspite of these efforts, and additional efforts by the state and local education agencies, the problem is still with us.

The demonstration programs funded under ESEA TITLE III and other such programs have given many insight into strategy, process, instructional approaches, and administration of reading programs, but these projects have affected a very small percentage of the school districts throughout the Nation.

ESEA Title I has done much to improve reading and the other basic skills of elementary students throughout the Nation. The problem with Title I is that while it can have a significant impact on those children two or more grade levels behind in reading ability, it does nothing to correct the system that produces these failures. We need both levels of effort. One to correct the mistakes our system has produced, and the other to change the system, the process of education, to assure that we do not continue producing educational and reading failures. It is just this system-change process that the State Right to Read Program produced.

The State Right to Read Program is not a grants program, but rather a strategy to assure that all data and information that we have attained over the past years are brought together within a single management approach that assures excellence in reading.

The State Right to Read Program consists of major parts, each of which are vital to systematic change.

1. The establishment of a State "Criteria of Excellence" to serve as a standard of what a reading program should be.
2. A commitment by the school board and school officer to the development of a quality reading program.
3. The amassing of public support to assist in the resolution of the reading problem.
4. The preparation of reading leadership at the local school level.
5. The development of a state and local plan of action.
6. The implementation and evaluation of the plan of action.

The Right to Read State Agency Program was initiated by The Office of Education in 1972 with five states participating in demonstration projects with an initial $10,000 Grant; these five states were to develop a process to impact the National reading problem. In Minnesota, this grant in conjunction with monies made available by the Minesota Commissioner of Education and the commitment of the Governor of the State of Minnesota, gave impetus to the development of the Minnesota Right to Read strategy. It is important to know the premises on which this program was built. They are vital to its success.

1. All but one per cent of the population can be taught to read, the parents have the right to expect that each one of their children will learn how to read.
2. Drastic reform is necessary of at least that part of the educational system which has so consistently produced such a large number of functionally illiterate individuals.
3. The needed reform is not something that can be purchased, because no solution appears to be for sale. Mere money alone will thus not solve the problem. The solution will need to be built rather than bought.
4. The needed reform must be comprehensive in order that rural as well as urban, small as well as large, and non-public as well as public school districts are served equally. By comprehensive we also mean that the out-of-school illiterate is served as well as the in-school population.
5. The needed reform must be systematic and pervasive, rather than consisting of a stab here and a stab there. Random demonstration projects cannot solve the problem, for a system cannot be changed by merely working with a component—one teacher at a grade level, one grade level in a school, one school in a district, or one or two districts in a state. A system is changed by systematically getting to everyone and everything directly. Minnesota has 436 school districts and 464 non-public schools. All contribute to the problem. The solution will not be realized by only working with a few. The nation has about 18,000 school districts. The implication should be apparent.
6. The plan for reform must be replicable. Not only should the plan permit us to solve our immediate problems in the area of reading, but it will hopefully apply to the solution of other problems and in other locales.
7. The plan for reform must have clearly stated objectives, defined action steps, the necessary human and dollar resources, a broad base of support, and a limited amount of time in which to complete the task.

Proceeding from the established premises, the plan was developed. It appeared that in order to eradicate functional illiteracy in Minnesota's schools and out-of-school adult population, the state should attempt to do two things. The state should provide direct technical assistance to local education agencies (LEA's) for an extended period of time in order that quality reading programs may come to eventually be built. By technical assistance we mean the kind of help and knowledge that the typical LEA is unable to buy for itself. By local education agency, (LEA) we mean each and every public school district (436) and non-public school (464) which voluntarily seeks help. By extended period of time, we mean up to three and one-half years. By quality reading programs, we mean programs which are able to meet the State of Minnesota Criteria of Excellence in Reading Programming. The technical assistance will help LEA's to achieve these criteria. This role of being a provider of technical assistance on a massive scale is new to the State Department of Education.

The state should also seek to ensure that each LEA come to eventually possess its own technical assistance person. We will call this person a reading director. This will be a leadership position. The reading director will be prepared to assume this role by completing a program of preparation, a curriculum, as conducted by State of Minnesota personnel.

On October 2, 1972, the Minnesota State Board of Education created a new position in Minnesota schools, that of reading director in Right to Read LEAs. A local education agency which designates a person as reading director may consider that person legally qualified to serve in that position upon his/her completion of the program of preparation.

The Minnesota Plan assumes that if an LEA is able to truly achieve the Criteria of Excellence, and if the LEA is served by a truly competent reading director, it will follow that functional illiteracy will be on its way to eradication. There is no single component more essential for educational reform in reading than the development of a "Criteria of Excellence." It provides the basis for assessing school district and community needs; it identifies the areas of training need for teachers and administrators; it serves as an evaluative tool in determining progress toward the stated goal and it alleviates the fear of change by showing what changes are to be made.

The Criteria of Excellence in Minnesota was established by the State Advisory Council for Reading. This Council included educators, parents, reading specialists, and a variety of others who represented concerns about reading and the educational system. Educators are too prone to avoid the identification of specific learning objectives. The Criteria of Excellence clearly stated what an effective, failure-proof, reading program in the public and private schools should be. This document served as a guide for school districts in the development of a comprehensive approach toward meeting the reading needs of children and adults.

The document not only deals with the institutional process, but also addresses all areas of the educational process which impinge upon learning. Certain criteria addressed the administration and organization of the reading program. There was a commitment to student learning and not just to staff teaching. The organization and management of the classroom was clearly addressed, as well as local community leadership and organization. The Criteria of Excellence recognized that a program must be comprehensive, not just dealing with one segment or a few grades of the school program, but addressing a pre-school through adult effort. It stressed the use of community resources and supported the development and initiation of intensive in-service training for teachers, support services for the administration, faculty, staff, volunteers, and parents.

Such a Criteria of Excellence has been developed in thirty-one Right to Read States along with a commitment to implement such a program on a schedule designed by each participating state agency.

In Minnesota we begin by a 240 hour training program of local reading directors from 22 pilot districts selected regionally throughout the State. Each of these reading directors were responsible for the initiation of Right to Read Programs in their local districts, whether they be public school or private school districts. From that group of 22 local reading directors 8 were selected to serve as regional directors and to implement our "multiplier effect." The second phase of the program found each of the regional directors conducting classes of preparation for 20 or more new reading directors within their respective regions. By continuing this process over five phases in the past three years, we have now provided reading leadership at the local level in nearly three-fourths of our 440 school districts and 200 plus private school districts.

The larger school districts such as Minneapolis and St. Paul determined that the program would be more effective in the metropolitan schools if a reading director was prepared and assigned to each of the units within their school district. Minneapolis, for example, has employed seven reading directors, each of which has been assigned to an educational pyramid, i.e., a senior high school plus the "feeder" junior high schools and elementary schools within a specific geographical location.

In some of the small school districts and in the private schools, the position of the reading director may be combined with that of a master teacher or a principal. The important factor is that a specific, trained individual be delegated both the responsibility and the authority to carry out those functions that will reshape the system to meet the reading needs of children, youth and adults.

What impact has this strategy had on the reading program in Minnesota? This is the vital question.

Participation.—Nearly three-fourths of Minnesota's 1,000,000 students attend public or private schools committed to Right to Read concepts. This feat has been accomplished in three years with no promise of money to local school districts, only the opportunity to improve the quality of education. They receive only technical assistance, reading leadership training, and an opportunity to share reading program materials and ideas with each other.

Volunteers.—The greatest untapped resource this nation has in education are the citizens themselves. Parents, senior citizens, and students are currently providing millions of hours in volunteer services to the Minnesota Right to Read Effort.

In the adult literacy program alone, more than 3,000 volunteer tutors have completed 12 hours of training and are working in every section of the state, providing the opportunity for adult non-readers to overcome a handicap more severe than many physical and mental handicaps.

Finance.—The Minnesota State Legislature has added over a million dollars to this effort. ESEA Title V funds also were used to increase the initial Federal grants. Seven other states now have passed or have pending legislation supporting their respective Right to Read programs.

Evaluation.—Minnesota has initiated a twelve phase evaluation program which includes statewide assessment of reading skills. These studies have indicated a surging enthusiasm for the Right to Read effort by teachers, administrators, parents, and others surveyed. But most significant, a study conducted by an independent evaluation firm of 22 Right to Read districts, found after seven months of program involvement that students in Right to Read districts achieved 2½ times more than students from non-participating districts.

Other Factors.—The Right to Read concept encourages, supports, and enhances reading programs for all students. We all recognize the need for programs for the gifted and talented, but little has been done except in isolated demonstration programs to provide for the needs of these students. However, under the Right to Read "umbrella," the Great Books Program has increased from 14 school districts serving 1800 children in 1972, to 110 school districts serving 25,000 students in 1975. Similar growth has been observed with RIF, Book Fairs, and other reading program activities.

Similar results are taking place in States across the nation, but it takes time to set in motion a program of the magnitude reached through the Right to Read State Agency Effort. The remaining 18 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia just received planning grants a few months ago. Twenty other states have been in operation a little over two years. To terminate legislative authority for funding at this time is simply unbelievable.

H.R. 8304 authorizes the U.S. Commissioner of Education to continue the State Right to Read Program under Title VII of the Education Amendments of 1974. Also, it permits the States to continue their work with secondary age students and adults as well. Without this amendment, program funding will expire in 31 states on February 28th, 1976, and in the remaining states, after one year of planning, in June, 1976.

The Honorable Wendell R. Anderson, Governor of the State of Minnesota, has been an educational leader in providing the impetus necessary to initiate a program of educational reform. In his speech to school administrators, launching the State's Right to Read Program, he made the following predictions.

"First, we must abolish functional illiteracy so that all our citizens, rich and poor alike, will have a better chance to learn from the accumulated wisdom of man. This is the goal of our Right to Read program, and to achieve it we must not only eliminate the existing reading and literacy deficiencies of today, but also reform our educational institutions so that these problems will not reoccur tomorrow."

I am sure the U.S. Congress had no intentions of terminating the State Right to Read program when this P.L. 93-380 was passed. This program has the strong endorsement of the Council of Chief State School Officers, as well as U.S. Commissioner Bell. The prompt passage of H.R. 8304 will assure that thousands of children, youth, and adults will have the opportunity to learn to read, and that the system that produces failures will be changed.

Thank you.

Criteria of Excellence in Reading Programing

1. There is coordination of all of the administrative facets of the reading program.
2. There is continuous progress organization of the reading curriculum so as to preclude omissions.

3. There is a record keeping system for individual pupils.

4. There is a complete testing system which includes the use of criterion-referenced measures.

5. There is a commitment by staff to pupil learning.

6. There is refined accommodation of the varying moments of readiness, varying rates and modalities of learning, and special needs and problems of all children.

7. There is accommodation of the Instructional Reading Level of all children.

8. The materials that provide the basis for reading instruction must fairly reflect the racial, cultural, and sex differences found in our society.

9. There are curriculum adjustments in other subject areas for the children who are unable to cope with grade level reading matter.

10. There is ongoing in-service education for the total certificated teaching, supportive, and administrative staffs that is both intensive and extensive. Certificated staff will also include substitute teachers. Supportive staff is interpreted to include librarians, teachers of special subjects such as music and physical education, counselors, et cetera.

11. There is a program of preparation in reading for non-certificated staff who work in the classroom, such as teacher aids, parent volunteers, et cetera, and for the auxiliary personnel associated with the school.

12. Opportunities are provided to junior and senior high school teachers in academic subject areas to develop the competencies which will allow them to accommodate the varying reading achievement levels of their students.

13. Each local education agency has a cadre of trained volunteer reading helpers.

14. There is an adult basic education component.

15. There is defined curricular provision within the LEA for individuals at both extremes of the aptitude continuum.

16. There is an articulated pre-school component that involves parents.

17. There exists readily available school and public library resources and services.

18. Provision has been made within the local education agency to produce instructional and practice materials for distribution to the teachers of reading. Materials that allow pupils to work independently and that articulate with the defined curriculum of the LEA are desirable.

19. Junior and senior high school teachers of reading have a demonstrated knowledge of developmental reading as it relates to their local education agency's curriculum.

20. The Board of Education of the local education agency has established an incentive program for teacher in-service education in reading.

21. Each local education agency defines their reading curriculum and makes the information available to the public.

22. Each local education agency has identified someone within the LEA who has the authority responsibility, and time for the development and maintenance of a quality reading program .

23. The local education agency annually has available the achievement levels of their pupils in reading by grade and/or age level.

24. Each local education agency has developed a reporting system for reading development that fully, accurately, and specifically documents a child's learning and provides such information to the parents.

MINNESOTA's RIGHT TO READ EVALUATION DESIGN

I. Reading Achievement of Pupils in Grades 2, 4, and 6 in 11 Phase I Right to Read LEAs and 11 Non-Right to Read LEAs During the 1972–1973 School Year.

Purpose: To assess pupil growth in reading attributable to Right to Read participation. Study report completed in September of 1973.

II. State of Minnesota Educational Assessment and Right to Read Mini-Assessment of the Reading Achievement of 9 Year Olds.

Purpose: To assess pupil growth in reading attributable to Right to Read Participation. Pretest administered in January of 1974. Posttest to be administered in January of 1976.

III. A Study to Determine the Percent of Minnesota 16 Year Olds and Citizens Over 16 Years of Age Who Meet the Definition of Functional Literacy.

Purpose: To assess the extent to which Minnesota has/has not realized the national Right to Read objectives. Instrumentation to be developed beginning in 1975. Instrument to be administered in the fall of 1979.

IV. A Report of the Number of Out-of-School Illiterates Who Have Learned to Read as a Result of the MLCI and Right to Read Partnership.

Pupose: To determine the number of literacy projects, individuals trained as tutors, individuals being tutored, and the number having learned to read. Annual Report filed beginning in May, 1974, and to continue through remainder of decade.

V. A Study of the Impact of the Minnesota Right to Read Program on School and Community: An Attitudinal Survey of Participants.

Purpose: Determine the attitudes of participants about what is happening within the LEA as a result of participating in Right to Read. Survey of Phase I Participants done in January of 1974 and report completed in May of 1974. Survey of Phase II and III participants to be done in fall of 1975. Survey of Phase IV participants to be done in fall of 1976. Survey of Phase V participants to be done in fall of 1977.

VI. Processes and Results of Establishing Quality Reading Program: An Evaluation of the Minnesota Right to Read Program.

Purpose: To assess the degree to which the 24 performance standards are being realized, and to evaluate the reasonableness of those standards. Survey of Phase I and II LEAs done in June of 1974 with final report completed in March of 1975. Survey of Phase, I, II, and III LEAs to be done in September of 1975. Survey of Phase I, II, III, and IV LEAs to be done in September of 1976.

VII. An In-depth Analysis of a Right to Read School District.

Purpose: To document the experience of a school district as it goes about the process of implementing the Right to Read strategies. Effects of institutions and individuals have been sought. The study was begun in August of 1975, and the report completed in January of 1976.

VIII. Special Education Questionnaire.

Purpose: To gather information regarding the relationship of special education and the Right to Read effort. The survey was done in September of 1974 with the report completed in December of 1974.

IX. A Study to Determine Why LEAs Did Not Elect to Voluntarily Participate During the Primary Thrust of Right to Read (January, 1972–June, 1976).

Purpose: To identify the reasons for failing to participate. The Study is to be undertaken in February of 1976.

X. A Study of Evaluation of the Right to Read Model for Reform.

Purpose: To examine the strategies employed and assess the efficacy of those strategies combined with conclusions drawn as to why or why not each was successful. This study is to be begun in June of 1976.

XI. Letters of endorsement.

XII. Opportunities for individuals and agencies to piggyback on Right to Read in evaluative efforts.

[Reprinted from COMPACT, April 1975 Education Commission of the States]

The Ambitious Goal of Right To Read

James Vangen's eyes twinkled above high cheekbones and a neatly cropped beard as he took his place on the speaker's podium. He spoke in a fluid, folksy style and many of his observations drew thunderclaps of applause from an audience of educators and the governor.

Vangen talked for several minutes, without notes. He couldn't have read them anyway. James Vangen is illiterate.

That an adult nonreader could stand before reading experts and educators and extol the value of one state's effort to combat illiteracy symbolizes both the problem and the promise of reading instruction in the United States.

In an era when state decisionmakers are concerned with such issues as bilingual/bicultural education, compensatory education and education for the future, they must still face the fact that nearly 19 million Americans over the age of 16—enough people to populate the cities of New York and Los Angeles combined—are functionally illiterate (unable to read at the fifth-grade level).

For James Vangen, a middle-aged construction worker from Jonathan, Minn., the American Dream had turned sour. But now, through an ambituious five-year program in his state, there is the whispered promise of learning to read.

The program, Minnesota Right to Read, is one of 31 similar state efforts across the country. The goal in Minnesota is to make 90 per cent of the state's adult population and 95 per cent of its in-school children literate at the fifth-grade level by 1980.

Although most of the 1,000 adults enrolled in the program demand and receive anonymity, Vangen sees no reason to hide that he neither reads nor writes above an elementary level.

"You know, I couldn't spell my last name until I was in the third grade," he recalls.

But the important thing—in his mind and in the minds of state reading officials—is that he is trying. For the past three years, Vangen has been working with an adult tutor under the Laubach method of reading instruction, which uses visual representation of words and meanings. It is one of a number of methods used throughout the nation to teach adult nonreaders.

Through his minor successes, Vangen has become an apostle of the cause, an advocate of the Minnesota adult reading program. He has spoken publicly of his reading "handicap" and has been appointed to the Governor's Right to Read Advisory Council, as the group's only nonreader, in hopes of solving one of the most perplexing problems state reading officials face: how to reach adults with reading problems and get them into the program.

"That's our number-one headache here," says one Minnesota education official. "We know our state has thousands of adult nonreaders whom we can help. But how do you identify them? How do you convince them that we're here to help them?"

Various techniques have been used to get adult nonreaders into the reading program. Public appeals over radio and television and discussions with church and social agencies have produced some results, but not enough.

Without broader public knowledge, education officials feel, it will be difficult if not impossible to achieve Minnesota Right to Read's objective by 1980.

Volunteers are the cornerstone of the adult literacy program in Minnesota. Adult tutors receive 12 hours of instruction in the Laubach method in a highly structured, volunteer program.

Tutors are assigned to adult nonreaders, who pay for their own materials, usually less than $10 for five sets of books, ranging in reading difficulty up to the seventh-grade level.

James Vangen's tutor, Marian Gould, from Shakopee, Minn., says she gets personel satisfaction and a sense of achievement out of teaching adults to read.

"My biggest thrill in teaching these people is to try to convince them that they are not dummies, which is what they have been labeled for the past 10, 11 or 12 years in school," she says. "It is to say, 'Yes there is a place for you because you can do something.' "

And Vangen says: "I get a big thrill out of it now. I feel good when I can come home and maybe read what I'd read at Mrs. Gould's house and sit down and read it to my children. I'll stick with the Laubach course as long as I can. I don't want to have to depend on other people to do my reading for me."

The adult literacy program is only a part of Minnesota's effort to assure that every child and adult has the right to read. Under Hugh Schoephoerster, the state program's reading director, and State Education Commissioner Howard B. Casmey, Minnesota Right to Read also involves about 566,500 public and nonpublic school students in 388 districts and private schools—58 per cent of the state's elementary and secondary enrollment.

The fact that Minnesota Right to Read is in the classroom raises questions about the success of previous reading instruction. But Minnesota is not alone in this regard.

A recent report by a national advisory committee on dyslexia and related reading disorders revealed that of the 51.5 million students who leave the nation's schools in a given year, an estimated 8 million cannot read. That means the schools have failed to teach about 15 per cent of the nation's students one of the basics in education. But educators in the past have viewed the situation differently.

"Education is the only operating system in America that blames its own product for failure," Schoephoerster says, meaning that educators usually regard learning as strictly the student's responsibility. "If General Motors found that 15 per cent of its cars didn't operate the way they were supposed to, the company wouldn't be in business for long. The public isn't standing still for the excuse that if its children don't learn it's their own fault."

And that's where Right to Read seeks to differ from most reading programs. It is a "no-fail" proposition.

"If fewer youngers fail reading in Minnesota than in some other states, we're still talking about failure," Schoephoerster says. "It's our position that any child, except the one per cent with reading disabilities, can learn to read if given enough time. Our program is geared to the pace of individual students."

According to Doris Surprenant, one of eight regional Right to Read directors trained at the state level, the children are "picking up the security that comes from knowing they will learn. There's none of the pressure they used to feel."

A reading session in one of the state's public or nonpublic schools might find children reading from a basic text while their peers played games to improve their pronunciation and reading skills. Volunteer aids may be used to create a home-like environment in the classroom.

A local Right to Read director from a Mankato, Minn., parochial school said some side benefits of the program were reduced student frustration, fewer behavioral problems and development of the slow learner's positive self-concept. Other benefits included deeper understanding of students by teachers, improved effort and progress by students, and happier students.

Although the illiteracy crisis in Minnesota pales in comparison with other states with larger urban concentrations, reading has become the top educational priority of the Minnesota Department of Education and the office of Governor Wendell R. Anderson. It is an example of what can be accomplished when education and politics work together.

For Minnesota, the Right to Read program had its roots in the governor's office in 1971, when Anderson called for an all-out attack on illiteracy. He said the ability to read was "absolutely essential to the fulfillment of human potential in today's increasingly complex society. Without these [reading] skills, the student cannot effectively function in other areas of scholastic endeavor, much less hope for success in post-school employment or in life situations."

Minnesota was the first state to adhere to the concepts of a statewide reading program, part of a national Right to Read program initiated in 1969 by the late James E. Allen Jr., then U.S. commissioner of education, who called a national literacy campaign "education's moonshot."

Minnesota also was one of the first 11 states to receive federal funds for Right to Read from the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) in 1972. Currently, 31 states are involved in the program and many of them are using materials and strategies developed by Minnesota Right to Read. The national effort is expected to be expanded to all 50 states.

Anderson was cited recently by USOE for advancing the cause of National Right to Read. He was the first of 26 governors to issue a proclamation supporting Right to Read and the Minnesota Legislature is one of 13 to pass a bill giving financial assistance to state reading program.

Minnesota Right to Read draws much of its support from the community. Anderson says the state program "can be the rallying point for renewed confidence in our schools."

Studies at the turn of this decade found that 269,000 Minnesota residents had left school after completing fewer than eight grades. Many of them had reading disabilities or were functionally illiterate. Half the state's unemployed workers between 16 and 21 were functionally illiterate, unable to read or comprehend at the fifth-grade level. Seventy per cent of the juvenile male offenders in Minnesota had serious reading problems and one child in eight enrolled in state schools had a reading problem.

Nationally, things were worse. National Right to Read estimates that one child in four in the United States has a serious reading disability and that each year 70,000 children drop out of public school with reading levels lagging two or more years behind.

A study of federal prisons has found that many inmates barely function at the fifth-grade level although their average schooling level is between eighth and ninth grade. In New Jersey, the average reading level of the entire population in four of the major correctional facilities for juvenile delinquents is fourth-grade.

"There are all kinds of social implications tied to the ability to read," Schoephoerster says, pointing to the large numbers of persons on welfare, in correctional institutions and on unemployment lines who cannot read. "That's why legislators should be interested in supporting a reading program. It's not just for education but for the entire social milieu."

Although some state legislatures have supported Right to Read programs in their states, the national program has been functioning these past years without a specific Congressional authorization. Grants to states and special community-based programs have been made from discretionary funds in USOE and its appears that the well might run dry soon unless Congress approves sufficient funds for Title VII of the Education Amendments of 1974 (PL 93-380).

Last year National Right to Read spent more than $14 million in grants to 48 states, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands and the District of Columbua for both state and local reading programs. The possibility that those will be the last grants haunts those states whose legislatures have not spent their own money for reading programs.

"I guess we're a little smug about it," Schoephoerster says, "because the Minnesota Legislature has been providing state funds to supplement federal grants." Since 1972, Minnesota Right to Read has received $553,000 in federal grants and $400,000 from the Minnesota Legislature. In all, the state spends $40 million annually on reading programs administered at the state level, but the total runs even higher when local funds are included.

Has it all been worthwhile? Schoephoerster says it has and points to an evaluation the state conducted on students involved in the first year of the program. The results, based on testing at 11 schools in Right to Read and 11 not in the program, showed that students in the program outperformed their counterparts in 40 of 55 "significant" comparisons.

The results of a recently completed reading assessment of 9- and 13-year-olds in Minnesota have been less clear-cut, however, and some educators question the validity of the evaluation.

Schoepoerster acknowledges that "we may have to wait a few years" until the impact is fully felt, but he is convinced that the program is well on its way to achieving its objectives.

Most educators, meanwhile, support the idea of a national reading program and the new Congress has been considering a $12 million package for reading improvement.

"After all," one Minnesota educator said recently, "to say you're against reading is like saying you're against Motherhood, Apple Pie and the Flag."

STATEMENT OF EDWIN E. CAIN, DIRECTOR OF FEDERAL/STATE PROGRAMS, MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

Mr. CAIN. Thank you. I will talk about what I think are some of the real concerns and what the States have been doing, particularly Minnesota, but other States as well.

This Right to Read program began with five States back in 1972. This was quickly added to 11 States when we found that we really could make a difference. In 1973, 31 States became involved in the program. Now we have virtually all 50 States involved in the Right to Read program at the State level.

Some people say that phonics is the problem. Some say poor home environment is the problem. Let me contend this—and this is the basis of the State Right to Read program—that there are actually many problems that are keeping children from learning to read. If we are going to have any impact on this, we are going to have to deal with all these problems in an effective way and not just one or two of them. We must deal with all of these.

The whole process is designed to set up a system whereby we can help change take place. I would certainly have to commend Congress for the effort they have made through title I.

We are dealing with children under title I who are 2 years behind in reading achievement. What we are doing is treating the symptoms and not the causes. If we were really going to cause a difference in the educational system, we would have to treat it at two levels. We have to do something about the children who are behind. We also have to do something about a system that has failed these children.

This is in general what the State Right to Read program is about. How can we change the system so that we don't continue to produce failures throughout the years?

There are several items that we have set up as a premise for a program. We are assuming that all but 1 percent of the population can be taught to read, and that parents have the right to expect that each one of their children will learn how to read.

No. 2, that drastic reform is necessary for that part of the educational system which has so consistently produced such large numbers of functionally illiterate individuals.

No. 3, that needed reform is not something that can be purchased because no solution appears to be for sale. Money alone will not solve the problem. That is a terrible thing to say to Congress. But we really believe this. The solution must be built rather than bought.

What we are saying is that we have seen this under the title III programs and the demonstration programs we have a big infusion of money into a school district to come up with some unique type of system to solve the problem. Three years later when the funds are gone we find that in most instances these programs revert back to where they were.

This is not to say that money isn't needed for special cases for title I kids, for bilingual education and for dropouts. These things are needed. But we must change the system. We can't change the system with a great influx of money.

We are also saying that the reform must be comprehensive. We can't deal with just urban or rural areas or with the suburban. We have to deal with all areas. We have to deal with the out-of-school nonreader. This must be systematic and pervasive. It can't be just a staff here and a staff there, a school district here and a school district there. We must deal with the total entity. We can't go into a single school in a district. We must deal with all of the schools in that district.

The gentleman from Alabama mentioned earlier that the Birmingham schools made a commitment to resolving the reading problem no matter what it took to do it. This we see as the first criteria for making any change in the system. There must be a commitment to that change.

If we are to have that type of change, we must have a system to see that it takes place. One of the first State functions is to train educational reading leaders for each school district to work within that district to bring about the total change that is necessary. We use the word "Gestalt." We are talking about the total impact of the program, the family, the outside influences, the total instructional process, the administration. All these things are necessary in order to change the system.

As things come out of other demonstration programs throughout the country, we have a system then for feeding these into. Each of our local reading directors offers a minimum of 30 hours of instruction inservice training to each of our teachers each year.

This basically is what the 31 States are involved in. Now with 19 other States involved in the planning process this is where they are going to be going.

Our great concern is that now we have a bill that is going to fund some demonstration programs. Title VII, as it stands now, drops the mechanism whereby these things can be implemented. This has been the problem in education for years.

We now know a great deal more than we are doing in our schools today, as the Commissioner said this morning.

Let me just state a couple of things that we have accomplished. There is no single answer to this. Since we began in 1972, with a strong endorsement by Gov. Wendell Anderson, we have involved more than three-fourths of Minnesota's 1 million school children in the Right-to-Read program. This means that three-fourths of the school districts have made a commitment to do whatever is necessary to bring about the changes. Each one of these school districts has received nothing in the way of money to do this. In fact, it has cost them money because they have had to designate an individual who is going to be their reading director and who has a total responsibility and authority to carry out what is necessary.

The other thing I want to mention, that is extremely important, is the volunteer program. This is the greatest untapped resource that we have in our country today. We have over 3,000 adult tutors dealing with the adult literacy problem in the State. These are scattered throughout the State. So any adult who needs help in tutoring, we have the facilities to work with that person. One of our greatest assets is senior citizens. This has been a two-way street. It has been great for them as well as an invaluable resource for the school.

As for finances, what has this brought about? With the very small meager Federal grant, the State legislature has put in over a million dollars into the State Right to Read program. Seven other States I understand also have pending legislation to support this type of program.

We have a 12-part evaluation system that I have included in my written testimony which just basically talks about the basic trend we are moving toward on our evaluation. We asked an outside evaluation corporation to come in and to do an independent study. We found that in our 11 Right to Read school districts that the achievement rate of those Right to Read students exceeded the non-Right to Read school district by 2½ times. This happened after a period of 7 months. The total program had not been implemented.

Under the book program in 1972, we had 14 school districts which provided programs for 1,800 children. In 1975, with the report that just came out from the Great Books Foundation, we found that now we have 25,000 students with 110 school districts involved.

One item that should be mentioned is the key to the whole strategy, I think. This is what we call our criteria of excellence in reading program. At the outset of the program we brought together a State reading council, saying that these are the things that must take place in the school district in order to have an effective program.

The 31 States have also adopted a similar criteria. There is a great deal of similarity between these. They are dealing with the total structure that impinges upon the educational process. This provides a guide for educators, saying "this is what should take place in education."

If there are any questions I will be happy to answer them.

Chairman PERKINS. Mrs. Chisholm?

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you very, very much, Mr. Cain, for your statement.

Mr. CAIN. Thank you.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Money often fails to really bring about change because people fail to look at the basic structure of the program. You indicate that reform has to be drastic. It has to be total. Involving volunteers, involving senior citizens who have so much to offer is very encouraging.

There is only one basic question that I want to ask you. Do you feel that the quality of instruction these days in our colleges and universities is not really preparing teachers to deal with this problem? Close to 25 percent of the population of this country, adults and children, are illiterate. How do you feel about that?

Mr. CAIN. There was a study several years ago which indicated that the amount of preparation in teaching reading, that 19 States required no preparation in reading and some States required only 3 hours of preparation. When you realize that one-third of the time of elementary teachers is spent teaching reading, that it is not sufficient to have a one-shot in-service training program. It doesn't work. We have got to have a person available to that district to have an ongoing in-service program so that they are available to that system. The whole process of bringing in a college reading teacher once a year for 2 days doesn't work. As much as these people can be helpful, we have got to have something different from that. That is why we say in the State program that we have got to have reading leadership at the local level and this has to be one of the first commitments by the local school districts, to do this.

I should mention that in the larger schools, Mrs. Chisholm, that for example in Minneapolis they have employed seven reading directors that are associated with each of their pyramid groups. They have decentralized their program this way. St. Paul has done the same thing.

You are absolutely right. There is inadequate preparation, not only in the number of hours but I think, probably, in what is being taught.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have no more questions.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Quie?

Mr. QUIE. Thank you. I think it speaks highly of this Right to Read program, to achieve 2½ times as much as those districts that weren't.

Also, I am struck by the involvement of adults. You don't limit this to just formal education and elementary and secondary schools, but you take it to adults who need help. I am pleased how this actually stimulates them like some other types of programs have not done. So I want to commend you for what you are doing.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Miller?

Mr. MILLER. I have no questions.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Buchanan?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Cain, I would like to thank you for your testimony. The leadership you are giving Minnesota in this area is quite impressive. Do we know what the changes are that must be made?

Mr. CAIN. Some of these are spelled out in our criteria of excellence. But briefly we feel that a continuous reading program must exist in the schools. You have to have individual recordkeeping for students. You have to be sure that you have a testing system that will delineate those concerns that a student has with a system that spells out what skills are necessary in order to read and where that student is at any given time.

I applaud this committee for the handicapped bill because you are talking about having parent-teacher conferences. We also require in our State for the Right to Read program that teachers are required to have reading conferences with their parents at various times throughout the year, not just a pat on the back, saying "your child is doing fine," but exactly where that child stands in regard to his reading progress. The parents have to be part of the system. These are the types of things that are indeed important.

We have a local reading director who is responsible for instruction to the teachers who have not gotten it in their teacher preparation courses.

But this State program is going to die if something is not done urgently about this amendment. The funding for our program ends on February 28 of this coming year. Already some States are talking about releasing the State reading director because they feel that no money is going to be coming. It is extremely urgent that action be taken on this quickly.

Chairman Perkins. Thank you very much, Mr. Cain. You have been most helpful in your testimony. I am delighted with the great job you are doing and the service that you render to the country.

Mr. Cain. Thank you.

Chairman Perkins. Our next witness is Mrs. Robert McNamara, chairman of Reading is Fundamental, Incorporated. She has been doing tremendous work in this area and has established many, many worthy projects throughout the country. We are honored to welcome you this morning, Mrs. McNamara. We are eager to hear your suggestions and some of the results that you have already discovered.

Mrs. McNamara. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. May I please introduce Dr. Sydney Nelson, president of Reading is Fundamental? This is Mrs. Barbara B. Atkinson, our national program director.

Chairman Perkins. Without objection your prepared statement will be inserted at this point in the record. You may proceed anyway you prefer, Mrs. McNamara.

[Prepared statement referred to follows]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MRS. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA, CHAIRMAN OF READING IS FUNDAMENTAL

I am deeply honored to be asked to present this Statement to the Chairman and Members of the Committee and for the opportunity to tell you about a program that has been working to help toward solving a national problem—children who cannot read and are not reading.

THE PROBLEM

43% of all elementary school children are in critical need of help with reading.

20% cannot keep abreast of their age group in school because they are unable to read.

Millions of youngsters with average ability read far below their potential.

How then, are they to live in our increasingly complex technological world? How is the country to continue to develop when 18½ million Americans, age 16 and over, cannot read a want ad?—as reported by a Harris Poll in 1970. Educators as well as business and industry are acutely aware of this situation. Congress has reflected its concern by appropriating almost ½ billion over these next four fiscal years for federal assistance in improving reading skills and combating illiteracy.

The Federal government has twelve major programs with reading components. But in spite of these efforts, no educational method has yet met with widespread or continuous success. However, educators are finding that many excellent methods of teaching do get results *if the child is motivated.* They know, too, that motivation cannot be imposed, that it must develop freely in a child.

Motivation is the missing ingredient, both at home and in school. Reading Is Fundamental supplies this vital ingredient and the necessary *parent involvement* to reinforce the child's educational development.

There has arisen in the last 20 or 30 years a need to change and make the tools for reading, "books", available to all children of America. It is appalling to find such statistics as eleven states do not necessarily require textbooks or workbooks to be provided by the schools. Of course the burden of this falls on the poor. It is appalling to find that in many areas there are no places available for parents to find or buy inexpensive paperback books for their young children to be read to them. As a matter of fact, inexpensive books for the young children of our country, particularly those in isolated or in poverty stricken areas, have not been readily available.

WHAT IS READING IS FUNDAMENTAL? (KNOWN AS RIF)

Reading Is Fundamental (RIF) is a national, non-profit, tax exempt organization *designed to motivate children to read.* Its goals:

To demonstrate that books—in the home as well as in the classroom—are essential to a child, and that books should be available to all children to own, borrow and buy, and

To educate the American public to the fact that at the present time this is not the case and to show through our programs the exciting and cohesive force produced when educators and communities, parents and children, organize their resources and efforts to produce a more literate society.

The program is unique in that it stimulates the interest of children in books by letting them choose from a wide variety of attractive, inexpensive paperback books that interest them, and by letting them keep the books as their own.

In many cases, RIF books that youngsters take home are the very first they have ever owned, for the children served are poor—from the inner city, on Indian reservations, in Puerto Rican and Chicano "barrios," in Appalachia's holows, in remote rural areas and among migrant workers. Most of them come from homes where there are no books, where no one reads for reference, or for learning, or for simple enjoyment. It is one thing to know how to read and another to widen horizons through reading *many* books.

The local programs with their thousands of volunteers and many local organizations are self-sustaining, using private and federal program funding.

RIF'S RECORD

Over three million children have received 5½ million paperbook books since 1966.

Over three million children have received 5½ million paperback books since Hawaii and the District of Columbia), locally operated and funded—through either private sources or the use of monies for books from Federally funded supplementary programs.

10,000 parents and community leaders have been mobilized to implement RIF programs.

Teachers report children are reading more, exchanging books with their friends and building home libraries.

Both school and public library circulations have increased markedly where RIF operates.

Parents are actively involved in RIF programs and are buying for their children, reading to them, reading themselves.

As exciting as reaching children is, an equaly essential ingredient is the expanding of the RIF audience to involve the parents of the children who are receiving the books. The by-products of parent involvement are greater interest in, and ability to cope with the educational needs of their children. In making books and reading a natural part of a child's daily experience—by allowing the child to bring his or her own books home—RIF has found that entire families are stimulated to read, enjoy, and own books.

Teachers are most enthusiastic to have supplementary materials and many Language Arts teachers are using them in creating interest in play activity—puppetry, art, poetry, and writings.

WHY RIF SUCCEEDS

The child is motivated to read through the magic of free choice and pride of ownership of books and their retention in the home.

Active parent involvement is a basic requirement of all RIF programs.

RIF helps to strengthen the home, school, community relationships.

There are hundreds of cases where a parent comes to the school for the very first time in order to participate in the RIF program.

DESCRIPTION OF VARIOUS RIF PROJECTS

Distribution of paperback books in schools.—The children freely choose their own books and retain them in their homes. The program is done in depth, and each child receives five books per year. For many of them, these RIF books are the only things they own. Parents, teachers, and volunteers supervise these programs.

Paperback libraries in classrooms.—For reading during the school day and at home. The children are permitted to keep the books at the end of the year.

Library incentive programs.—A free book is given for every eight books read. Children reading more than 32 books are presented a gift library of 10 books at their schools' awards ceremonies.

Summer programs in neighborhood parks.—A RIF bookmobile circulates books on a lending basis, supplemented with free book distributions.

Rural programs.—RIF's bookmobile units visit rural areas, distributes books and involves parents in program implementation.

Distributions at day care, pre-school and community centers.—RIF works with these centers to develop programs around RIF books.

Seeding church youth libraries.—Paperbacks are provided to encourage starting of church youth libraries.

Community book fairs.—Book fairs are held each year in RIF communities for the sale of books at discounted prices.

Books for health clinics, social service centers and juvenile courts.—Parents are encouraged to take home their childrens' favorite books.

Reading break programs in secondary schools.—Secondary schools are assisted in developing "reading break" or "sustained silent reading" programs in which RIF books are available in class to be read during a special reading period each day.

NATIONAL RIF'S AND SERVICES

National RIF is the nerve center of all RIF activity initiated and carried out throughout the country. It oversees the network of RIF projects through a great variety of program and service activities. It is targeted towards the area of early childhood education with primary concern for the children in the inner city, in hollows of Appalachia, in "barrios", on Indian reservations and in remote rural areas.

From the National office, RIF's activities include the following:

Serves as a clearinghouse for all information and requests for RIF programs from all over the United States.

Provides consultation and materials for projects through two program directors at the National office and two regional directors. Provides field services—training seminars and regional cluster meetings for personnel, parents and volunteers involved in developing active programs. This is an important multiplying factor.

Advises on activities to local RIF committees to insure the cooperation of volunteers, with school and library personnel and with community groups and agencies in the implementation of programs.

Mobilizes support and sponsorship of RIF projects by national organizations such as American Association of University Women, Urban League, Junior League, Jaycees, American National Red Cross, Church Women United, Black Business and Professional Women, Business and Professional Women, Exchange Club, Federation of Women's Clubs, Kiwanis, Rotary Club, Concerned Black Parents, Inc., National Council of Jewish Women, National Council of Negro Women, Service League, Soroptimist, and many others.

Prepares materials, which include a Handbook on how to organize and maintain quality RIF programs. Separate Modules of this Handbook cover—How to Organize; How to Order and Distribute Books; How to Involve the Community; How to Evaluate.

Organizes public education programs through radio, television, films, exhibits, and brochures.

Conducts ongoing research on new paperback children's literature and reading motivation. Books range from pre-school through 10th grade reading levels.

Prepares a Book Selection Guide with an annotated paperback list (with special attention to grade and interest level) including books pertinent to Black, Indian and bilingual children. A new book guide is being published in May—prepared by reading experts from the field of education and endorsed by a Board of educators, librarians, teachers, and parents. These books range from fun and puzzle books to the classics, science, career, fiction, and history. They are the best of the paperbacks. The book ordering is done by the local program committees.

Maintains records and reports and a data collection system for ongoing evaluation.

Provides information service to local projects on legislation and Federal funding.

Publishes a newsletter quarterly.

Assists in identifying funding sources for local RIF projects in addition to raising all the funds to maintain a National office that provides these services.

THE INCREASING PUBLIC DEMAND FOR NATIONAL RIF'S SERVICES

The tremendous public demand for National RIF's programs and services is most vividly illustrated by the rising volume of requests for assistance in starting RIF projects and the continuous increases in the number of RIF projects. In calendar year 1973 there were 12,800 requests for information about starting RIF programs and in calendar year 1974 there were over 20,000 requests.

FUTURE PROGRAM PROJECTIONS

Statistics on the growing number of RIF projects show a similar pattern. At the end of fiscal year 1970–1971 there were 18 projects. At the conclusion of the 1971–1972 fiscal year there were 55. In June of 1973 the number had risen to 128. At the end of March 1974, RIF's active and developing projects totaled 209 in 46 states. We now have over 400 projects. At the present rate of growth, RIF projects will be serving a minimum of 700 communities throughout the United States by 1977.

ENDORSEMENTS

RIF's program has been endorsed by the Secretaries of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare as well as the U.S. Commissioners of Education; the American Library Association; and many other national distinguished organizations and leaders in all walks of life.

RIF's individual programs are being endorsed and adopted by school systems in communities throughout the country. Last year, the New York City Board of Education initiated RIF programs for 50,000 children in 100 schools.

THE NEED FOR FEDERAL SUPPORT OF READING IS FUNDAMENTAL

RIF will celebrate its 10th year in 1976. It has proven itself and grown from one pilot project program in Washington, D.C. to 10 model programs throughout the country in widely diverse areas and subsequently to our present number of over 400 in 46 states.

We believe that the Federal government should share with us the financial responsibility for carrying out an important educational mandate which supplements and compliments what the Federal government is doing to help to finance the education of our children. We are totally engaged in helping to solve a public problem of enormous significance.

To quote—Ralph Waldo Emerson, "In the highest civilization the book is still the highest delight. He who has once known its satisfactions is provided with a resource against calamity."

Thank you.

LOCATION OF RIF PROJECTS

ALABAMA

- Active RIF Projects:
  - Huntsville
  - Montgomery
  - Selma
- Developing RIF Project:
  - Anchorage
  - Fort Payne
  - Millbrook

ALASKA

- Active RIF Projects:
  - Anchorage
  - Bethel
- Developing RIF Project:
  - Anchorage

ARIZONA

- Active RIF Projects:
  - Phoenix
  - Pinon
  - Rough Rock
  - Salt River Reservation
- Developing RIF Projects:
  - Bullhead City
  - Phoenix

ARKANSAS

- Active RIF Projects:
  - Clarkville
  - Conway
  - Jasper
  - Little Rock
  - Sheridan
- Developing RIF Project:
  - Crossett

CALIFORNIA

- Active RIF Projects:
  - Anaheim (Orange County)
  - Baldwin Park
  - Bishop
  - Campo
  - Claremont
  - Dixon
  - Dos Palos
  - Downey
  - Firebaugh
  - Hughson
  - Los Angeles
  - Madera
  - Merced
  - Norwalk
  - Pacific Grove
  - Pasadena
  - Rialto
  - Salinas
  - San Diego
  - Santa Cruz

CALIFORNIA—continued

  - Santa Fe Springs
  - Stockton
  - Upland
  - Whittier
- Developing RIF Projects:
  - Aromas
  - Avenal
  - Blythe
  - Hacienda Heights
  - Oakland

COLORADO

- Active RIF Projects:
  - Arriba
  - Fort Collins
- Developing RIF Projects:
  - Boulder
  - Colorado Springs
  - Monte Vista

CONNECTICUT

- Active RIF Projects:
  - Hartford
  - Stamford
  - Stratford
  - West Hartford
  - Windsor
- Developing RIF Projects:
  - Enfield
  - Middletown
  - New Britain
  - North Grosvenordale
  - Southbury

DELAWARE

- Active RIF Projects:
  - Middletown

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

- Active RIF Projects:
  - (two active projects)

FLORIDA

- Active RIF Projects
  - Clearwater
  - Lakeland
  - Miami
  - North Palm Beach
  - Orange Park
  - Orlando
  - Pensacola
  - St. Petersburg
- Developing RIF Projects:
  - Lake Butler
  - North Miami Beach
  - Orlando
  - Tampa

LOCATION OF RIF PROJECTS—Continued

GEORGIA

Active RIF Projects:
- Athens
- Canon
- Clarkston
- Milledgeville
- Warner Robins

Developing RIF Projects:
- Albany
- Americus
- Calhoun
- Decatur
- Madison

HAWAII

Active RIF Projects:
- Kailua

ILLINOIS

Active RIF Projects:
- Charleston
- Chicago
- Danville
- Elmwood Park
- Galesburg
- Pekin
- Peoria
- Rockford

INDIANA

Active RIF Projects:
- Battle Ground
- Columbus
- Edinburg
- Evansville
- Gary
- Lafayette
- Michigan City
- New Castle
- Pekin
- Peru
- Rensselaer

Developing RIF Projects:
- Anderson

IOWA

Active RIF Projects:
- Keokuk
- Newton

Developing RIF Projects:
- Center Point
- Newton
- Sioux City

KANSAS

Active RIF Projects:
- Parsons
- Wichita

Developing RIF Projects:
- Leavenworth

KENTUCKY

Active RIF Projects:
- Booneville
- Danville
- Flemingsburg
- Frankfort
- Jackson
- Louisville
- Owensboro
- Pippa Passes
- Shepherdsville
- W. Prestonsburg

LOUISIANA

Active RIF Projects:
- Alexandria
- Baton Rouge
- Mer Rouge
- New Orleans
- West Monroe

MAINE

Active RIF Projects:
- Waterville

MARYLAND

Active RIF Projects:
- Baltimore
- Great Mills
- Rockville
- Silver Spring
- Snow Hill
- Westminster

Developing RIF Projects:
- Rohrersville

MASSACHUSETTS

Active RIF Projects:
- Boston
- Charleston
- Framingham
- Holbrook
- Holyoke
- Lowell
- Waltham

Developing RIF Projects:
- Dorchester
- Malden
- Pittsfield
- Worcester

MICHIGAN

Active RIF Projects:
- Alpena
- Brighton
- Detroit

LOCATION OF RIF PROJECTS—Continued

MICHIGAN—continued

- Dorr
- Grayling
- Flint
- Highland Park
- Holland
- Lansing
- Monroe
- Pontiac
- South Haven
- Ypsilanti

Developing RIF Projects:
- Cass City
- Muskegon
- New Boston

MINNESOTA

Active RIF Projects:
- Cloquet
- Hermantown

Developing RIF Projects:
- Glenwood
- Grand Rapids
- Winnebago

MISSISSIPPI

Active RIF Projects:
- Clarkedale
- Grenada
- Jackson
- Ocean Springs
- Pascagoula
- Starkville

Developing RIF Projects:
- Batesville
- Biloxi
- Brookhaven
- Gulfport
- Jackson
- Kosciusko
- Meridian
- Prentiss

MISSOURI

Active RIF Projects:
- Belleview
- Bolivar
- Fayette
- Ferguson
- Kansas City
- St. Louis

Developing RIF Projects:
- Montgomery City

MONTANA

Active RIF Projects:
- Great Falls
- Hardin
- Winnett

NEBRASKA

Active RIF Projects:
- Scottsbluff

Developing RIF Projects:
- Lincoln
- Omaha
- Winnebago

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Active RIF Projects:
- Amherst
- Tilton
- Whitefield

Developing RIF Projects:
- Nashua
- Portsmouth

NEW JERSEY

Active RIF Projects:
- Atlantic City
- Camden
- Hightstown
- Newark
- Plainfield
- Woodstown

Developing RIF Projects:
- Camden
- New Brunswick
- Newark
- Trenton
- Vineland

NEW MEXICO

Active RIF Projects:
- Cuba
- Dexter
- Sanostee
- Santa Fe

Developing RIF Projects:
- Clovis
- Espanola
- Socorro
- Zuni

NEW YORK

Active RIF Projects:
- Alton
- Bridgehampton
- Callicoon
- Long Island
- Mount Vernon
- New York City
- Brooklyn
- Manhattan
- Oneida
- Oneonta
- Peekskill
- Poughkeepsie
- Rochester

LOCATION OF RIF PROJECTS—Continued

NEW YORK—continued

- Syracuse
- Utica
- Whitney Point
- Wolcott

Developing RIF Projects:
- Horseheads
- Morris
- Newburgh
- New York City
- Manhattan
- Ripley

NORTH CAROLINA

Active RIF Projects:
- Burlington
- Charlotte/Mecklenburg
- Dunn
- Durham
- Greensboro
- Greenville
- Lumberton
- Madison
- Shelby
- Wilson

Developing RIF Projects:
- Andrews
- Charlotte
- Eden
- Fairmont

NORTH DAKOTA

Active RIF Projects:
- Buxton
- Devils Lake
- Fort Yates
- Mandaree
- St. Michael
- Walhalla

Developing RIF Projects:
- Bismarck
- Turtle Mountain

OHIO

Active RIF Projects:
- Alliance
- Baltimore
- Batavia
- Cincinnati
- Circleville
- Columbus
- Dayton
- Newark
- Springfield
- Zanesville

Developing RIF Projects:
- Dayton
- Lima
- Lorain
- Moscow
- South Vienna

OKLAHOMA

Active RIF Projects:
- Oklahoma City
- Tulsa

OREGON

Developing RIF Projects:
- Pendleton
- Sisters

PENNSYLVANIA

Active RIF Projects:
- Allentown
- Altoona
- Braddock
- Conshohocken
- Erie
- Lafayette Hill
- McClellandtown
- Harrisburg
- Philadephia
- Pittsburgh
- Reading
- Washington
- West Chester
- West Grove

Developing RIF Projects:
- Albion
- Coatesville
- Conshohocken
- Fairview Village
- Harrisburg
- Howard
- Lester
- Port Allegany
- Snow Shoe

RHODE ISLAND

Active RIF Projects:
- East Greenwich
- Exeter
- Hope Valley

SOUTH CAROLINA

Active RIF Projects:
- Beaufort
- Bishopville
- Myrtle Beach
- Saluda

Developing RIF Projects:
- Summerville

SOUTH DAKOTA

Active RIF Projects:
- Aberdeen
- Harrold
- Huron

Developing RIF Projects:
- Martin
- Rapid City

Location of RIF Projects—Continued

TENNESSEE

Active RIF Projects:
- Knoxville
- Nashville
- Roane County
  - Edgewood
  - Harriman
  - Kingston
  - Oliver Springs
  - Rockwood

Developing RIF Projects:
- Cookeville
- Savannah

TEXAS

Active RIF Projects:
- Arlington
- Austin
- Beaumont
- Dallas
- El Paso
- Galveston
- Hebbronville
- Houston
- Killeen
- Newton
- Seguin
- Texarkana
- Tyler

Developing RIF Projects:
- Abilene
- Lubbock
- Stamford
- Waxahachie

UTAH

Active RIF Projects:
- Salt Lake City

VERMONT

Active RIF Projects:
- Richford

Developing RIF Projects:
- Bellows Falls

VIRGINIA

Active RIF Projects:
- Hampton
- Newport News
- Northern (Arlington, Alexandria, Fairfax, and Reston)
- Powhatan
- Richmond
- Virginia Beach
- Williamsburg

Developing RIF Projects:
- Berryville
- Charlottesville
- Church Road
- Galax
- Hopewell
- Jeffersonton
- Roanoke
- Saluda

WASHINGTON

Active RIF Projects:
- Auburn
- Lakewood Center
- Longview
- Union Gap

Developing RIF Projects:
- Maple Valley

WEST VIRGINIA

Active RIF Projects:
- Mercer County
- Mingo County
- Princeton

Developing RIF Projects:
- Charleston

WISCONSIN

Active RIF Projects:
- Milwaukee

Developing RIF Projects:
- Iron River

[From the Burlington (N.C.) Times-News, June 22, 1975]

Knowing the Joy of Owning Books

Do you remember your first book?

Probably not! Books are such a part of most of our lives today that we take them very much for granted.

But this has not always been the case, and still isn't for some young people. And these are the young people I want to tell you about.

A few months back, the Woman's Club initiated a program in Eastlawn School in which fifth graders were given an opportunity to choose five books which they were allowed to keep as their very own.

"Reading is FUN-damental was the program's title. It was referred to as "Rif," and the idea was that reading can be fun as well as educational.

As a compulsive reader who reads the cereal box, the candy wrapper, the egg carton and anything else that contains the printed word, the program had an immense appeal for me, and I went over with some of the Woman's Club members, just to witness the light that came into the eyes of some of the children as they realized that these books were to be their own to take home and read, to keep or give away or do whatever they wished with them.

So it was a great pleasure for me when Marian Duff, Woman's Club representative who headed up the program, offered to share some of the letters of appreciation that she had received from the students.

It would be impossible to print all of them here, of course, and some of them were very clearly "duty letters" required by the teachers. But some of them were so sincere in their appreciation that excerpts are worth sharing.

Patricia Lee Oliver wrote, "I thank you for providing the rif books for us. My brother and me share our books and daddy buys us books, so now we have 38 books or more. Daddy built us a bookcase and I'm planning to paint R.I.F. on the bookcase. Again I thank you for your kindness."

Anna Doss wrote about her cookbook, noting, "My mother has learned to make things out of it also."

Rodney C. declared that the books he got were so good that he has read all of them at least three times, and Terri Haith noted that she and her friends had traded books with one another for more reading pleasure.

Dorthea Rogers said, "I take good care of my books. I have a shelf and I play school and library with my friends. They like to get my books and read them. But if they hurt my book they know what!"

Maybe one of these books will have an influence on some child's future. A youngster named Bryan wrote, "—I liked the book on gems and metals best because some day I want to be an archeologist and I have 166 rocks like fossils, arrow head, lava, pumice and many more rocks."

Brian (no last name signed) wrote, "The books were fun reading and any time I had nothing to do I would read the books."

"Thank you for the wonderful books you gave us. I liked them very much. Speshely the last two books. Thank you again and good-by. Sencerly" was the way Todd Kelly's letter read.

"—I like them because they were exciting and something that could happen to anyone" was the way Dottie Floyd expressed her appreciation.

A little boy named William put it this way: "We really want to thank you for the books and we wish you would give us some more of those nice books. I really don't have that much to say. And we think you are doing a real nice job—"

A wistful note from Otis Caldwell Jr. expressed his pleasure in the books and said that we would not be able to participate next year because he has moved and will be attending another school.

Other notes expressed not only appreciation, but praised Mrs. Duff as "kind, beautiful, nice, lovely—etc." One student, Michael Thomas, declared "—When I see you I'm going to respect you like you were my own mother. I hope you keep on being nice to other children like you were to me. Other children deserve to be able to meet someone like you.—"

One mother also wrote a letter of appreciation in addition to those from the children.

Such expressions of appreciation and such lavish personal praise should make it easy for Marian to get volunteers to assist with R.I.F. at Eastlawn and other schools next year.

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, Nov. 17, 1974]

MIGRANT'S KIDS GET FREE BOOKS

(By Judy Burke)

About 2,000 migrant children in New York State will get a book of their own this summer to read, hug, hide or mangle, paid for by the state education department.

Kathryn J. Burns, newly appointed coordinator of the New York State Migrant Reading Is Fundamental program, yesterday gathered 15 teachers and day care workers from across the state to help her choose good books from hundreds spread out in the Powers Building office of Program Funding, Inc., a migrant worker organization.

Most of the teachers were familiar with the Reading Is Fundamental program, which gives books to children, because they got books from it last summer.

Michael Fennell, who teaches Spanish-speaking Puerto Ricans and French-speaking Algonquin Indians in the Bloomfield Central School District, was looking eargerly for books on Indians, so that his children could learn something about their history.

He said he got a book last summer for an Indian girl in high school. "It was about an Indian girl, with the problems of a clash of cultures. . . . It had everything. The girl really got a lot out of it."

Many of the children have never owned anything, and they are excited and serious about choosing a books to keep, Fennell said.

"One boy last summer carried his book with him, wrapped in a blanket," he said.

"The kids like it. . . . It was fun to watch their criteria for choosing books, which were different for each kid, and it was fun to see the pride in ownership."

Janice Astles, who teaches at Marian House, Inc., the migrant center in Waterport, said the children are relieved to have something permanent, something that doesn't stop when the picking season stops.

"It was a stable thing. They didn't have to leave everything behind that was their education program. They were very proud," she said.

Mrs. Astles said the preschool children of Marian House are at the age to love repetition. Owning a book means the child can look through it again and again.

"The older brothers and sisters read to them at home, I think, because they come back to the center and they know parts by heart," she said.

Fennell and Mrs. Astles were looking for books that would touch off emotional response in children. Fennell wanted books about Indians, while Mrs. Astles liked a book called "My Cat Likes to Hide in Boxes," because children like to hide in boxes.

"Even if they don't have a cat, it's easy to relate to. It's fun," she said.

She wrote down another book choice, called "You're the Scaredy Cat."

"It's good for children to see their emotions," she said. "You don't deal with feelings like anger and fear by telling them they shouldn't feel those things."

Reading Is Fundamental, a six-year-old program started in New York migrant centers last summer. Ms. Burns got money from the Bureau of Migrant Education this fall to expand the program throughout the state.

"It works," she said. "As the books sifted back to the camps, the parents started getting turned on. The parents would sit down and read to their kids. The sharing process was amazing."

Fennell said that's the idea—to have families that read.

[From the West Side Times, July 18, 1974]

JUNGMAN KIDS GET FREE BOOKS

Examining their own books are children at the Jungman school, 1746 S. Miller, who received them when the Reading Is FUNdamental program distributed 230 free books in the first summer book distribution conducted by the non-profit organization.

Parent volunteers from this community distributed 230 free books last week to children attending the Jungman school at 1746 S. Miller, in the first book distribution held during summer months in Chicago by Reading Is FUNdamental.

Led by Frances Roberto of 1626 S. Morgan, local R.I.F. captain, 19 volunteers from the Reading Is FUNdamental program helped out as the first through sixth graders chose from a selection of over 500 titles.

RIF is a non-profit organization that stimulates reading interest among children by giving them books they can keep. "The children participate in the process from the beginning," said Mrs. Roberto. "They even help decide on the selection list for the distributions."

Once a book has been selected (without prompting from parents), the child's name is written in the front cover and the book is his to keep.

"Many of the children trade their books, once they've read them," she said. "This way they get to read several selections between distributions during the year." RIF conducts five book distributions each school year.

"The attitude changes after the kids get a couple of books they can keep," said one teacher at the Jungman distribution. "RIF really helps, because the kids get to keep the books. In many cases, these are the first books they've ever owned."

[From the Oneonta Star, Nov. 9, 1974]

SECOND GRADERS GIVEN BOOKS OF THEIR OWN

Every second grade child in Oneonta was given a chance this week to choose a book for his or her very own.

To some children it was like Christmas, Mrs. Harry Pence, book distribution chairman reported.

The books were this first distributed under the Reading Is Fundamental (RIF) program. Members of the American Association of University Women, of which Mrs. Pence is president, and volunteers from the Woman's Club of Oneonta visited each second grade class in Oneonta—St. Mary's, Bugbee, Greater Plains, Riverside, Center Street and Valleyview.

Each child chose a book, fiction or non-fiction. There were 77 separate titles. Children who were absent will also get an opportunity to choose.

"Teachers in the schools told us that some of the children did not have children's books in their homes. Their delight in chosing a book was a joy to see," Mrs. Pence said.

The books selected were recorded on a sheet according to the school so that books purchased in the future will be the type for which children showed preference. RIF recommends five books per child per year.

The money spent in purchasing the new paperbacks for distribution used all the money previously collected. More funds are needed before the next distribution. Jaycees are currently collecting books which will either be sold or distributed in the program.

Kiwanis, the Oneonta Teachers Association and the Eagles all gave sizeable contributions to start the program, Mrs. Pence said.

Checks may be made to RIF. Oneonta, and sent to Mrs. Mildred LaBarr, 2 Walnut St., Oneonta.

Organizer of the RIF program here was Lee Tawney, former Hartwick College student.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 17, 1972]

LOVE OF BOOKS BROUGHT HOME

(By Patricia Ford)

A reading atmosphere in the home is an important part of creating a love of reading in children, according to findings by Pittsburgh's Reading is Fundamental (RIF).

Mrs. Lavera Brown, director, said emphasis on family home reading has initiated a new parents project for RIF.

"Kids will be turned off books if there are none in the home," she believes, so RIF has collected 30,000 adult books to be given to parents as part of the summer program.

BOOKS KEPT, EXCHANGED

RIF distributes the free books from a mobile unit. The books may be kept or exchanged at 18 community agencies cooperating with RIF to serve as exchange libraries. The agencies are located in the Hill District, the North Side, Homewood-Brushton, East Liberty-Garfield and Hazelwood-Glen Hazel.

But the main purpose of RIF, now in its third year here, is still creating a love of reading in children.

Mrs. Brown explained that the dual objectives of RIF, "ownership and self-selection," were designed as a motivation toward a love of reading.

RIF is now concentrated in six low-income communities around Pittsburgh since the disadvantaged child was found to have acute reading problems.

"Many underprivileged children lack the means to purchase their own books which intensified their lack of interest in reading," the director pointed out.

READING "PUNISHMENT"

Added to the financial problem was the fact that "parents or teachers often selected the reading material for the children. Reading and book reports were a task and even a punishment," said Mrs. Brown.

The director stressed that RIF does not teach any skills. "We are trying to motivate the child to enjoy reading by letting him select his own book which he may 'own' and keep for himself."

RIF distributed books at 29 schools in the six communities. The program uses school yards and city day camps during the summer where the mobile unit can pull up and open its doors.

Mrs. Brown anticipates reaching 10,000 children in the playgrounds and another 1,900 through the day camps.

The director was especially pleased with the co-operation of the City of Pittsburgh, Department of Parks and Recreation. They are paying for the books distributed this summer.

SLIGHT CHARGE MADE

A change in this year's program was also noted by the director. Previously, all books were given away.

"To see if the children and parents were really committed to the program, we set up a charge of 10 cents for every book over the first three, which were free," she explained.

"The response was fantastic. We anticipated that half of the program children would buy one book; the results were two-thirds of the children buying three books."

Mrs. Brown would like to expand the program in the 29 schools to include grades one through six. She also believes the basic theory could be used in more affluent areas.

"We pinpointed the low-income area schools because many families could not provide book money," she explained, "but the project itself can be used for any child.

"Even though wealthier children have the financial means for good education and good books, they may lack the motivation to read."

[From the Courier-Journal, Apr. 3, 1974]

CARTER HAILS READING IS FUN WEEK

(By Joan Kay)

For a contest this spring at Carter Elementary School, first grader LaShay Arnold coined the following couplet:

"Reading is a treasure.
It gives us real pleasure."

A jingle composed by fifth grader Toni McAfee read:

"The day is light,
The day is bright,
And when I read a book,
I'm out of sight."

The children are two of the winners in a contest leading up to Reading Is Fun Week, which began yesterday at Carter Elementary School.

Puppet shows were presented to the children yesterday by members of the Junior League of Louisville, and today there will be story hours held by members of the Carter PTA and other volunteers from the community.

Tomorrow and Friday will see the culmination of the week's celebration and also that of a six-month project by the local project committee of Reading Is Fundamental (RIF). The finale will be the distribution of more than 500 books to kindergartners through sixth graders, one book per child.

The purchase of the books, given free to each child, was made possible by donations from individuals, clubs, businesses, churches and foundations.

The national organization of RIF was founded in 1966 in Washington to stimulate interest in reading among young children by letting them choose from a wide variety of books.

Mrs. Vera Dockery, Louisville project director, heard about RIF through a television advertisement, and last fall she asked a group of friends to form a local chapter.

One of the factors in choosing Carter for the initial distribution of books was the fact that 65 per cent of the children enrolled there were reading below their age level.

On the project committee with Mrs. Dockery are Mrs. Barbara Atkins, Mrs. Joyce Bass, Mrs. Alice K. Houston, Mrs. Gwendolyn Howard, Mrs. Faye McBride Owens, Mrs. Deanna S. Tinsley and Mrs. DeVon D. Turner. Assisting them is an advisory committee made up of representatives from Carter, including the principal, Mrs. Josephine Trowel, and other people from the community.

To build up excitement about the book distribution, the school held a contest, and each grade level decided whether it would write jingles, rhyming couplets, or essays or make posters.

The winners, in addition to LaShay and Toni, were Donna Rouse, kindergarten, and Cynthia Leslie, second grade, for posters; Monterro Anderton, third grade, an essay; Gloria Henderson, fourth grade, a poem, and Tanya Roberts, sixth grade, an essay.

The fifth graders also did posters to decorate the cafeteria, and Kelvin Leslie won a special prize given by his teacher, Mrs. Mary Curry. The school gave a special prize for an essay to Charlotte Humphrey, a sixth grader in Project Read, which is designed to meet the needs of children who read below their grade level.

In choosing the books to be given out, a committee of representatives of the Louisville Free Public Library, the Carter School faculty and the RIF committee worked from a selection guide sent from the national RIF office. The teachers also elicited suggestions from the children on the types of books they liked to read.

In seeking community support for the project, the committee members first wrote letters to prospective donors and then followed up with personal calls.

Mrs. Dockery was very pleased with the initial response. "Wherever I'd go to talk about it, the people would get excited about the concept of the whole program, and the conference would go on 30 or 40 minutes."

Contributions came from 75 individuals, 10 civic and social clubs, 10 business firms, two churches and two foundations.

The Louisville chapter of Jack & Jill sponsored a bridge-whist tournament, and three office supply companies donated materials.

In addition, a local bookstore donated the prizes for the school contest and about 20 books to be used as an incentive later on in the program.

A representative of a national publishing firm has given 200 books which can be used as special prizes in future programs and also can be given to libraries of participating schools for the coming year.

As its own gift for the children, the project committee designed and had book plates made. "One thing we want to stress to the children," said Mrs. Dockery, "is that if they don't have a library at home, this can be the beginning. We really want to stress developing a personal library at home."

This week's distribution is hopefully the beginning of many others. Depending on contributions from the community, the local RIF is projecting for the fiscal year, beginning July 1, a total of 10 elementary schools, serving about 5,000 children, plus an additional 200 children in a summer program.

[From the Longview, May 16, 1974]

RIF: PARENTS, TEACHERS AND CLUBS JOIN TO PROMOTE READING BY CHILDREN

Reading in Fun is the confident title of a new organization working to raise money in order to buy books for underprivileged children.

Composed of parents, teachers, members of the American Association of University Women and the Junior Service League, RIF hopes to show that reading can be fun and that books are essential and should be made available to those that need them.

"We want to get parents and children into books and show them the treasures that are there," said Sandra Solbakken, chairman of the RIF program committee.

The group expects to buy books for some 680 first and second graders in two Longview Title I schools and one non-Title-I school, one Kelso Title I school and Headstart. A Title I school gets special federal funds because it contains low income and disadvantaged children.

In addition, third through sixth graders getting special reading help will also receive books. Children will have their choice of a number of titles, many of which are available through Scholastic books.

The books will be distributed at book fairs and story-telling hours in November, January and April. There will be a book swap in May, 1975. Volunteers will read books to children at the book fairs.

Money has already been donated by the AAUW, the Junior Service League, and others, amounting to about $600. A total of $1,500 is needed to operate the program and provide enough titles and a small amount for overhead, Miss Solbakken said.

Donations may be mailed to Gladys Morey, AAUW president, 106 Sunset View, Dr., Longview. Her phone is 636-4697.

The program is nationwide, although each community structures its program to its own needs. Mrs. Robert McNamara founded RIF in Washington, D.C.

Some of the persons involved in RIF are enthusiastic about its potential. "It's just another way of getting a child interested in reading," said Mrs. Morey. "We hope they'll get to like to read."

"It's unique," commented Connie Brock. "Placing books in the home involves parents, either by the child showing them the book or by their reading it to him. There is real motivation."

Marty Korten pointed out that "so many children come from homes that don't have any reading material except TV Guide. Even books with pictures are helpful."

Books open up worlds of the mind and imagination, and the women involved in RIF hope that the books they distribute will do that for children, for some of whom this may be their very first book.

[From the Flint (Michigan) Journal, July 17, 1974]

A Mom Gets Something Done To Help Kids With Reading

(By Greg Waters)

Mrs. Helen Davis is a woman who gets things done.

Last January she heard about RIF, Reading Is FUNdamental, a national program that gets kids interested in reading by providing them with books that are fun to read.

She decided to try to set up a pilot RIF project at Oak Elementary School, where her own children are students.

Next year, as a result of Mrs. Davis's efforts, each child at Oak will be able to select five books to read and keep for free. And the Flint Board of Education is trying to set up similar programs throughout the city.

Mrs. Davis gets things done.

"I was very disturbed when I found out that two-thirds of the kids in third grade at Oak are reading below their grade level, and 75 per cent of the sixth graders are poor readers," Mrs. Davis said.

"I saw ads for RIF in magazines and on TV, and felt that Flint should give it a try," she added.

RIF began in Washington, D.C., in 1966, the brain-child of Margaret McNamara, wife of the former secretary of defense. Mrs. McNamara was tutoring in a local elementary school, and was quite unhappy with the "See Johnny run" primers then in use.

She brought a copy of a Jules Verne adventure book to school, and turned several kids on to reading as a result.

The Ford Foundation gave her a grant to distribute quality paperbacks to D.C. schools where family income was under $5,000, and the results were fantastic.

The kids chose books that looked exciting, and begged their parents and teachers to show them how to read them. In a short time students who had been reading at low grade levels were asking for books that were well beyond their reading capacities. They were learning to read because they wanted to.

More than 130 cities now have RIF programs operating in their schools, and 4 million books have been distributed. Mrs. Davis has every reason to be hopeful about the success of the program in Flint.

In the past two months, Mrs. Davis has solicited funds from several Flint Businesses and organizations, including the Flint Junior League, the Flint Board of Realtors, Strange Cement Contractors, the student government at Hurley School of Nursing. Alpha Tau Omega fraternity at General Motors Institute, and the Oak School Community Council.

The biggest grant came from the Flint Public Trust, which gave $600.

The money will be used to purchase attractive paperbacks from publishers at greatly reduced rates. The average cost per book is 50¢ within the special RIF discount.

Mrs. Davis is working with the Parent Core Group at Oak, which is setting up three book distributions for next year. Each child at Oak will chose one free book at the first distribution, and two books at each of the following.

Mrs. Davis is quick to emphasize that the program will not be just another give-away.

"It is important to realize that the book distribution is only the first step," she said. "We're trying to get children involved in a lifetime program of reading."

Parents as well as children profit from RIF. In Houston it was found that after 80,000 books had been distributed, 92 per cent of the parents said their own home reading had increased. More than two-thirds said they had been stimulated to buy additional books for their children, and half of the children interviewed said they had bought other books for themselves.

Besides Mrs. Davis, three other mothers from Oak have been active in getting RIF started. Monica Clifton, Ethel Strange and Judy Tucker spent a great deal of time planning the program and getting the necessary support.

It's an example that individuals can get things done.

FREE BOOKS AND A FEELING THAT READING IS FUN, ARE OBJECTIVES FOR BROOKLYN RIF PROJECT

Encouraging community involvement in reading problems so that more parents will take an interest in reading, and more children will have books of their own, are two objectives of the National Reading Is Fundamental (RIF) program. Under the leadership of Dr. Seymour P. Lachman, Brooklyn member and vice-president of the Central Board of Education, a Brooklyn branch of National RIF has been established.

The program seeks student involvement through a book fair or other activity emphasizing the "fun" aspect of Reading Is FUNdamental. Each child chooses the book he wants and writes his name in it to underscore personal ownership.

"This is an attempt to continue the education process outside of school and take it into the youngsters' homes," Dr. Lachman explained. He hopes that the project will benefit all 12 community school districts in Brooklyn. "For too many children," he added, "a book is something associated only with school."

The Brooklyn RIF includes members of community school boards, the Brooklyn Public Library, the East New York Development Corporation, Brooklyn College and community volunteers. And advisory board representing the groups has prepared guidelines for a full-scale attempt to put books into the hands of 50-thousand children in Grades 1 to 3 in Brooklyn schools. A concerted effort is being made to solicit money from Brooklyn-based commerce and industry, private sectors and individuals to purchase inexpensive paperbacks for the students.

The National RIF program was founded in 1968 when it was funded by the Ford Foundation under the sponsorship of the Smithsonian Institute. Its activities are spreading across the country with some 81 local projects now underway nationwide.

Dr. Lachman's staff worked with the national group for the past several months to organize the Brooklyn project.

In April 1972, RIF, already in 26 states, began a Manhattan program. Since the beginning of the national project in 1966 RIF has distributed some 3-million paperbacks to poor children.

Speaking of the Brooklyn RIF, Dr. Lachman said that "a program of workshops for teachers, librarians, volunteers, parents and other liaison personnel is being developed in order to merge the efforts of all those who have the potential for reaching children." He pointed out that organizations and individuals can aid the RIF program by contributing to the funding and by active participation.

The Brooklyn RIF Advisory Committee can be reached, care of Mr. Paul Loughran, RIF Director, 131 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, New York, 11201, or by telephone: 625-7364.

[From the Austin Citizen, Sept. 19, 1974]

"Reading Is Fun(damental)" Makes It to Austin

(By Gayle Reaves)

The third graders at Austin's Allison Eementary are going on a field trip in a couple of weeks. When they come back it won't be with samples from a manufacturing plant or specimens from a nature walk.

The kids will come back with something many of them have never owned before—a book.

The nationwide Reading Is FUNdamental program, widely used in Houston, Dallas and other Texas cities, finally makes it debut in Austin Friday, Oct. 6 at Allison. On "Fun Day" every third grader at the school will get to pick out a book he or she likes, write his name in it, take it home, read it, re-read it, own it.

The RIF program at Alison, the first ever in Austin, is being sponsored by Friendship Community Center in the Montopolis area, not far from the school. Mary Browne, a former substitute teacher and a volunteer reading tutor, is coordinator for the effort. She is a member of Austin's United Methodist Women, who run the center.

"Roma Carper (president of the community center) was the one who started the ball rolling," Mrs. Browne explained. "She read about RIF in a national magazine, like so many others did, and sent off for instructions on how to begin a program.'

The premise of RIF is simple: it seeks to motivate children to read and to want to learn to read, by showing them that it is fun. RIF leaves the actual teaching of reading skils up to the schools. "Books are as essential to a child as are paper, pen and ink, and . . . books should be available to all children," says national RIF information.

Each RIF project is locally run and locally funded, and adapted to whatever special situations exist. The national organization works to publicize the program and, most essential, enables the local programs to buy books at discounts which are often greater even than the discount given to schools. More than 40 publishing houses participate in the program, Mrs. Browne said. "Without them we couldn't get books into the hands of the kids," she added.

"When people start asking the old question of 'Why can't Johnny read? the answer all too often is that he doesn't want to," Mrs. Browne said. "By offering a wide variety of attractive paperbacks which the children can keep, we hope to open up to them the joy that reading can be."

The first target of the new RIF program is the 150 students now in third grade at Allison. Each of the students wil be given five books this year and again for the next two years. Third graders were chosen to start the program because they had already acquired some reading skills.

The next goal of the program is to find the funds to add another grade to the program as soon as possible, and eventualy to increase the scope so that by 1976-77 all elementary grades from kindergarten on up will be covered.

The books to be given away were selected by librarians and Allison teachers from the RIF available list. About 6,000 books will be needed to complete the planned three-year program.

Mrs. Browne emphasized that, although the books are bought by Austin RIF at a greatly reduced price, they are not free to the local organization, and that funds are still being raised to buy them.

"We are just now beginning to get to the public with our request for money," the coordinator said. Local industries, some of which have already contributed, as well as Austin's numerous civic groups, will be approached about contributing.

Individuals can also help, she said. Fifty cents will buy one book for a child, $2.50 will provide that student with his year's choice of five books.

Parents in the Montopolis community will be aiding with the distributions and other volunteers will be welcomed, according to Mrs. Browne.

"We want to get children addicted to books," she explained. "Industries do it with free samples first, to entice people to buy and use the product later. Why shouldn't we do it with books?"

[From the Sentinel Star, Mar. 19, 1975]

STUDENTS "GRAB" AT BOOK OFFER

(By Sandra Mathers)

Turn 365 elementary school students loose among 565 books, tell them they may choose just one and watch an instant "book grab" come to life.

That's what happened Tuesday as fourth through sixth grade students at Lake Como Elementary School filed into the cafeteria, all set to "table hop" through biographies, mysteries, sports, science, riddles and jokes, animal stories, adventure, fables and "stories for fun."

Fun it was. Not a youngster realized he was participating in a county pilot program, RIF (Reading Is FUNdamental), a national, non-profit organization designed to interest children in books.

The Beta Gamma chapter, Delta Kappa Gamma, a teachers' honorary society, had purchased the colorful paperbacks, ranging from "Alice in Wonderland," "Heidi," "Little Women" and "Tales from Shakespeare" to contemporary offerings like "Gentle Ben," "TV's Stars of '73" and "The Life and Words of John F. Kennedy."

The cafeteria staff had gone to extra pains to prepare classroom sack lunches so the giveaway could run uninterrupted through the school day.

Each student busily picked and poked through the eye-catching titles.

Mary Wilbanks, 9, admitted she had singled out "The Wonderful Flight to the Planet Mushroom" because "I just like adventure stories."

"The Mountain Lion and Other Cats" intrigued Mike Cansdale, 9. "We already have three dogs at home . . . and one pretty big cat," he explained.

Clutching identical copies were bespectacled "best friends," Scott Stephens and Billy Schneckenberg, both 9, who insisted, "We just love stuff like 'How To Write Codes and Secret Messages.' "

When fourth grader David Woods picked out "How To Care for Your Monster," he had a purpose in mind: "I plan on getting one (monster) soon."

It was inevitable a "bookworm" or two would have trouble deciding. Susan Ricker, 10, balanced "Mystery Horse" on one hand and "Hurricanes and Twisters" on the other and announced she was "crazy about both." The horse won.

Honorary society member Vivian Pain, a retired Lake Como teacher, was delighted the children were so engrossed.

"We're sponsoring the program because too many children are turned off to reading the way they're introduced to it," she said. "Most children get only state-owned textbooks they have to be careful with, library books they must always return or books from parents who do the choosing.

"This way the children can take as long as they want to choose something they really like."

Lake Como kindergarten through third graders will be treated to the RIF giveaway in April and the entire student body will return for a second free book in May, the teacher said.

One saucy little blonde, who knew she would be returning in May, had her strategy down pat.

"I have two books I want, but since I can only take one, I've put the other one on the wrong (category) table under a bunch of other books," she confided. "That way when I come back I'll know just where to find it."

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 16, 1975]

They're All Ones for the Books

(By Sheilah Kast)

When you're 12, and the afternoons are just starting to feel like spring, and your buddies all stop by the bookmobile after school, you may stop, too. But that doesn't mean you're a bookworm.

And, if that lady is there again, giving out books at the little table behind the bookmobile, sure, you might stop and check it out. But that doesn't prove anything.

Twelve-year-old Marvin L. Edmunds seemed to be sending out warnings like that, some with his mouth and more with his eyes the other day. He sidled over to the Reading is Fundamental (RIF) table at the entrance to Spring Valley Apartments in Fairfax County. A half-dozen of his friends clustered there to pick which of the brand new paperback books each would choose to keep for his own.

"Have any basketball books?" Marvin demanded. Rita Quinn, the volunteer from the Service League of Northern Virginia who was distributing the paperbaks, explained that she had brought mostly baseball books. Was he interested in Sandy Koufax? Marvin slipped away, wearing his disdain like a mantle.

His friend Jerome, 9, found a book about the Superbowl to add to the joke and riddle books he had collected on previous RIF visits. He declared himself in favor of giving books, for keeps, to youngsters like himself "because the children want to learn how to read."

"I want a secret code book. Y'all got something about presidents?" demanded Marvin, who had slipped unnoticed back into the circle. Mrs. Quinn helped him look.

The Service League, which started doling out the books three years ago on a $30,000 total budget, is putting RIF up for adoption. Eventually the league weans all the projects it starts, according to its members.

"It's better to keep it," argued Neil Hamilton, 10, when told that the monthly visits of the RIF lady may be coming to an end.

"One day you might not finish (a book) all the way and you want to learn more," Neil said. Becides these paperbacks are "funnier than the ones in school, and easy to read and they're good to read."

Suddenly Marvin had found a book, a description of the Apollo moon mission that he chose, he explained, "because we're doing a unit at school." Like 5,000 Northern Virginia children before him, Marvin printed his name in the front cover, and the book was his.

"You can read it, chew it, tear it up in little pieces, stamp on it. It's your book," Mrs. Quinn explained to one child.

The Service League has been distributing 25,000 paperbacks a year in Northern Virginia's 20 publicly funded day care centers, in Alexandria's Title I schools, at Arlington's two high schools for dropouts, at a South Arlington YMCA, and at visits of the Fairfax County Libraries' bookmobiles.

Twenty-six elementary schools in the District and some schools and day care centers in the Maryland suburbs have the same program. There are locally funded RIF projects in 46 states; altogether, they have raised more than $1.5 million.

"To those living in Washington . . . that may not sound like much. But when you're talking about bake sales and garden clubs, that's a lot of money," Lynda Johnson Robb, a member of the National RIF Board, told a recent luncheon for 40 civic leaders whom the Service League is asking to take over the Northern Virginia RIF projects.

Most of the 40 agreed to join the new RIF group, but the extent of the program will depend on how fund-raising goes.

"I think that with the times being what they are, and maybe getting worse, it's going to be hard to get money," admitted Beth Hoffman, a reading curriculum specialist in the Arlington schools who will serve on the new board.

There are no statistics for measuring the success of a project which aims at making children and teens feel at east with books and, perhaps, motivating them to read, said Fran Vaughan, who cochaired the Service League's project last year.

But volunteers look for clues, like the upsurge in circulation noted by Fairfax County librarians in bookmobiles and accompanied by RIF volunteers. Only rarely, Mrs. Vaughan said, is the result as clear as it was when a teen-aged RIF client in South Arlington told his reading teacher:

"I'm 17 years old, and this is the first time I have ever read a book from cover to cover. Now I have read two."

[From the Salinas Californian, Apr. 4, 1973]

READING IS FUNDAMENTAL HOPES TO BRING BOOKS TO YOUNGSTERS

(By Don Dugdale)

A national program called Reading is FUNdamental (RIF) has begun in Salinas, on the premise that children who have books of their own are more likely to learn to read.

Backing up the need for the program is a Harris poll showing that 21 million Americans, age 16 and over, cannot read a newspaper ad.

RIF began in 1966 and since has expanded to 43 States and more than 150 cities. It's a privately funded nonprofit program that offers free paperback books to young children (kindergarten through third grade).

In Salinas the program is being sponsored by the American Association of University Women (AAUW), with cooperation from a number of other local organizations.

Twenty fraternal and civic organizations have representatives working on the RIF advisory board, which is just beginning its fund drive.

The committee is about to send letters to businesses, banks and financial institutions, and other institutions, clubs and groups, seeking enough money to start the RIF program in two schools this year.

Program chairman Mrs. James (Clarice) Bergantz says they need between $1,080 and $1,440 to distribute three or four new books to each child, based on an average cost [illegible]0 cents per book.

Publishers [illegible] special discounts to the program for ordering large quantities.

The whole idea behind RIF is motivation. Facing up to the fact that many children do not get the reading incentive they need in the home, the program seeks to get children interested in books by offering them copies of their own, and letting them choose the books from among 500 selected titles.

Without the interest and desire that RIF stimulates, Mrs. Bergantz says, children may never learn to read in spite of the efforts of new reading teaching systems.

With that interest, children who have previously been non-readers have shown the ability to overcome all kinds of difficulties, including chaotic family situations, and advance several reading grade levels in a year's time.

Books are distributed in special Reading is Fun days at the schools, manned by PTA and other volunteers.

Classes are brought one at a time to display areas in the school library, classroom or multipurpose room, where each child finds the book he wants, then has his name put onto a bookplate inside the cover.

Books are selected to meet the reading level and cultural interests of children.

Distribution can be made elsewhere, Mrs. Bergantz says, but the captive audience at school is where the most good can be done. "It's the kids who don't go to the library and who don't have books in their homes that really need it," she says.

"School authorities tell us there are countless children in Salinas who come from homes where there are no books.

"They are children who could turn into a statistic as depressing as that uncovered in the recent Harris poll," adds Mrs. Bergantz.

This year's pilot project is being aimed toward 600 children at Alisal and Lincoln schools.

Each succeeding year schools will be added until, Mrs. Bergantz hopes, enough funding is available to give three to five books a year to every kindergarten through third grade pupil in Salinas.

A year-end evaluation is planned after this year's program, involving children, parents, teachers and program volunteers in assessing the effect of the books on the children's reading habits.

The child is under no compulsion to report on his or her book, but Mrs. Bergantz, a former teacher, points out that students usually are more enthusiastic about discussing the book they own than one that is borrowed or assigned.

A film on Reading is FUNdamental entitled "Bequest of Wings" has been donated by the Salinas Kiwanis Club and is avilable for showing to groups.

Interested persons may call Mrs. Bergantz, or Lona Lang.

Contributions may be mailed to Mrs. Bergantz, 11 Calera Canyon Rd., Salinas, checks made payable to Salinas Area RIF Fund.

[From the Selma Times-Journal, Aug. 3, 1975]

OPENING THE WORLD OF BOOKS TO YOUNGSTERS

(By Jane Jouret)

There's more than one kind of hunger and a local sorority, Alpha Kappa Alpha, is responsible for filling an "educational emptiness."

They are responsible for putting smiles on little faces and books into eager hands through their Reading is Fundamental program.

The community service project was undertaken by the club in early 1974 when it was brought to the members' attention that the reading ability of the average child in Selma is one to two grades below the norm.

Nancy Sewell, Alpha Kappa Alpha president and consultant to the national RIF program, pointed out that the organization's two-fold goal is to create the desire to read among all children at an early age and to demonstrate that books are essential and should be available to all children.

"We focus on kindergartners to third graders because we feel that laying the foundation is the most essential thing. Getting a youngster "hooked" on books at an early age produces a life-long reader," she said.

Apparently the program which now receives some city and county funding is proving to be successful.

A Selma elementary school teacher whose students participate in the Reading is Fun Days the sorority holds at area schools says, "the desire and use of books in my class has definitely increased and happier faces are seen reading."

"My child and I now enjoy reading books together," said the parent of an RIF reader.

Clutching a paperback under her arm, a second grader said, "I like having books of my very own to take home to read."

Giving high-interest, low-level paper-backs to culturally deprived children originated in 1966 through the efforts of Mrs. Robert McNamara, the wife of a former secretary of defense.

Mrs. McNamara became concerned with the lack of reading material in some homes when she worked in the inner-city schools in Washington, D.C.

Here in Selma, the sorority holds their RIF "Fun Days" in eight of the area's elementary schools.

"On these days we (the Alpha Kappa Alpha volunteers) go in with a variety of books on all different subjects. In order to whet the children's appetites and to get them to pursue the paperbacks further, we will dramatize some of the stories as well as giving reviews on the books we bring with us," said Mrs. Sewell.

"Just to see their little faces light up when they get a book makes me feel sure that many times we are giving some child the first book they've ever owned."

She added that during the summer the RIF programs are held in the city's OEO centers.

The RIF project has proved to be so successful that the surrounding communities of Boykin, Camden, Marion, Sunny South and Georgianna have also adopted the program.

In Selma, the RIF school program is chaired by Mrs. Earlene Larkin and the summer program by Mrs. Martha Williams.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ROBERT S. McNAMARA, CHAIRMAN OF READING IS FUNDAMENTAL, ACCOMPANIED BY DR. SYDNEY NELSON, PRESIDENT; AND MRS. BARBARA B. ATKINSON, NATIONAL PROGRAM DIRECTOR

Mrs. McNAMARA. Thank you. You have the statement before you. You will find in it the material that Reading Is Fundamental has presented to this committee. I am deeply honored to have the opportunity to add to this and to tell you about this program that has been working for the last 9 years to help toward solving the continuing national problem of children not being able to read. This is what we have been talking about all morning and how we can change the system.

Excellent results are produced when a child is motivated. We haven't seemed to use that word this morning.

Reading Is Fundamental is a national, nonprofit, tax-exempt organization designed to motivate children to read. It provides a simple but very direct and effective way to make children become readers. It involves teachers, principals, community people, librarians. There are children who have no books in their homes and for whom a book is a new event.

Less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the public moneys that are spent in these United States in the public schools are spent for materials. This includes books as well as library books and other materials such as television or equipment for reading and so forth.

Nearly 3 million children have received 5½ million books since 1966 through programs operating in 46 States including Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

Ownership of inexpensive books should be a way of life for all children, not just the affluent. The need for a literate citizenry is absolutely essential.

H.R. 9048 is a great step forward to make books available to all children. Reading Is Fundamental programs have been supported and endorsed by the last four Commissioners of Education, including our present Dr. Bell. We have had a grant from the Office of Education.

The reading programs have been financially supported both by the public and private sectors. I am quite disappointed that the administration has found it necessary to recommend that this bill does not pass, particularly so because we have an involvement in both Federal and private funding for getting books in the hands of children.

It is nearly impossible for children in families in States such as, say, West Virginia, to be able to support such a program. All of our programs are supported and self-sufficient on their own. The moneys that are given for books are either raised by the individuals in the local community, or they are supported by foundations, national organizations, cake sales, you name it. We have done it.

We have had great cooperation with the Right to Read program and have introduced the concept of giving inexpensive books to young children in the Right to Read program in 30 of their programs. Also, through the ESEA, SEA title I, title III, and bilingual title VII, we have been able to fund several of our programs. As a matter of fact, it is not "several." It is over 35. Emergency Aid Act money has been used to support this program. The model cities has also supported it, as I mentioned. National organizations have taken it on. It is a most exciting combination of both Federal and local support. It is a tremendous need and a very simple one.

We do not teach reading. We provide the tools for reading, which are books. You can go to West Virginia, as we did, to a classroom, and you find the teacher is teaching 10 children in one corner, and a helper is helping with reading in another corner. There is a group over to the side. You ask what they are doing. "They are doing nothing," she says to you, "because they have no books."

There are some States in the United States that are not required to provide textbooks and/or workbooks. Some parts of those States do and some don't. We feel very strongly that if we could only change the system, as Mr. Cain has suggested—we feel that, with 9 years of experience, we have shown and proven the need for books, the need to choose books to own them, to have them in the home, not at school, not with strings on them.

The cost of this is just minimal. We used to be able to get five books for a dollar. We now get one and one-half books. These are quality, inexpensive paperback books.

We hope that the Congress will see fit to pass H.R. 9048.

To highlight a few of the RIF programs, I would like to ask Mrs. Atkinson to just briefly give you a couple of highlights, and we can have time for your questions, and I am sure you must have some, either for myself or Dr. Nelson and Mrs. Atkinson.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead.

Mrs. ATKINSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. As Mrs. McNamara said, RIF programs are locally planned and operated. Therefore, I would like the local communities to speak for themselves. Attached to the copy you have of the statement there are copies or reprints from newspapers. They are quoting RIF all over the country. These newspapers give accounts of RIF programs in several communities.

First, I would like to borrow from an editorial of the Burlington, N.C., Times:

> Do you remember your first book? Probably not! Books are such a part of most of our lives today that we take them very much for granted. But this has not always been the case and still isn't for some young people. And these are the young people I want to tell you about.

From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle in Rochester, N.Y., this describes how 2,000 migrant children and their parents participated in the first statewide RIF program that supplemented migrant education curriculum in New York. It says:

> The children are relieved to have something permanent, that doesn't stop when the picking season stops. One boy last summer carried his book with him wrapped in a blanket. It was a stable thing. They didn't have to leave behind everything.

From the West Side Times, Chicago, Ill., The attitude changes after the kids get a couple of books they can keep. RIF really helps because the kids get to keep the books. In many cases these are the first books they have ever owned."

From the Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, Pa., "We are trying to motivate the child to enjoy reading, by letting him select his own book which he may keep for himself." This article describes one of those programs which has been in operation for over six years. It is serving thousands of children from a variety of backgrounds. It is involving the community, from the parents to the major corporations, in proving the viability of RIF.

Next is the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky. "If the children don't have a library at home this can be the beginning. We want to stress developing a personal library at home."

From the Longview, Wash. This Day,

> Placing books in the home involves parents either by the children showing them the book or by their reading it to them. We want to get the parents into books and show them the treasures that are there.

Speaking of parents, the Flint Journal talked about Mrs. Helen Davis, the woman who gets things done. She decided to set up a RIF pilot project at Oak Elementary School where her own children were students.

Quoting Ms. Davis, the Journal says,

> I was very disturbed when I found out that two-thirds of the children in the third grade at Oak are reading below grade level and 75 percent of the sixth-grade readers are poor readers. I felt that Flint should give RIF a try. The program will not be just another giveaway. It is important to realize that book distribution is only the first step in trying to get children involved in a life-time program.
>
> Flint has gone from this one-school program to one that is now sponsored by a local foundation and is serving children in 20 of the elementary schools in that city.

Next, Brooklyn, N.Y.: A city school publication called "Learning in New York" says that "RIF is an attempt to continue the education process outside of the school and take it into the youngsters' homes. Dr. Seymour Lachman, vice president of the Board of Education in New York added, 'For too many children a book is something associated only with school.' "

Finally, from the Washington Star, here in Washington, D.C., describing a program in northern Virginia, it says, "There are no statistics for measuring the success of a project aimed at making children and teens feel at ease with books and motivating them to read. But volunteers look for clues, like the upsurge in circulation noted by Fairfax County Libraries, accompanied by the RIF volunteers. Only rarely are the results as clear as it was when a teen-age RIF client in South Arlington, Va. told his reading teacher, 'I am 17 years old and this is the first time I have ever read a book from cover to cover. Now I have read two.' "

It is this need and this concern and this involvement in communities, large and small, throughout the United States that has brought many diverse groups together in planning and implementing the 44 programs that Mrs. McNamara just described to you. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Mrs. McNamara, do you have any further comments?

Mrs. McNAMARA. We would love to have some questions.

Chairman PERKINS. All right. Mrs. Chisholm?

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. McNamara, I remember so well that you were one of the first persons that I met in the educational world when I came to Washington, D.C. I remember the enthusiasm with which you came to my office and discussed with me this new exciting program. You have remained committed and have done a tremendous job.

I seem to keep harping on this question of money. Maybe because of what is happening in New York City and even our Nation. But it is not "money, money, money" that is the answer to the problems that confront us.

You mentioned in your statement something that is so basic, and that is the question of motivation. How does one motivate the disillusioned and apathetic individuals from the lower segments of society to read, to want to get the tools to function in an automated society? People say you need money. But even if one has money, if the motivation is not there, money itself means nothing.

Some of the personnel in the schools in the Bedford-Stuveysant area have indicated to me that putting this program into the school situation and the local libraries has made all the difference in the world.

I don't have any real questions. I just want to say that you and your committee represent a group that has a practical approach. Thank you and your committee so much.

Mrs. McNamara. Thank you for your comments. It has been a long time since we have met. We have come a long way since that time. You are so correct in saying that we have to act and do something in regard to the reaction of the teachers and the principals to this kind of motivational program, bringing parents into the schools.

It is not a Lady Bountiful program where you are going out and delivering books. The parent is in the school many times for the first time to help distribute these books.

We can go on for hours, telling you story after story. But we come back to our young man who was in the fifth grade here in Washington, D.C. It still continues to happen again and again. He was in the fifth grade, reading on the second-grade level. He chose a book that was on about a fourth-grade or fifth-grade level. We asked the teacher, "Please don't tell the children what books they can't read."

This teacher couldn't resist. She said ,"Greg, I don't think you can quite read that book."

He said, "Oh, yes, I can. That is the one I want."

So they sat down before he went home for lunch.

She said, "Maybe I can help you."

He started reading right off the bat. He could read all the time. These are the children that we are trying to reach.

Dr. Nelson. I want to say, "amen." For just 1 or 2 minutes I want to focus on what seems to have developed in this hearing this morning which is rather startling. I heard a lot about test scores. We are hearing about programs geared to the technical aspect of teaching reading.

But I think we would all agree from our own lives' experience that one of the most important factors in learning anything is motivation. This is the one basic element that RIF has brought into the hopper, motivating the child.

The other point I want to make is that I believe very strongly that reading is not a segmental thing. Reading becomes a way of life. It was mentioned over and over again that the child is a product in his reading of a number of factors which socialize him.

The primary agent of a child's education, biologically and intinctively, is his father and mother at home. So the home environment is critical. Second, is the role played in the community by his peers or adults. Third, what happens in the school system. And all of this together impinging on him creates that opportunity to break that cycle of poverty, cultural poverty and educational poverty and economic poverty.

So when RIF came into this picture 10 years ago it was a great idea. It started primarily to motivate the child. But then all the byproducts started to develop. Intensive involvement of the parent in the home, a broad-based community organization throughout the United States with a carrot for every mule.

We are sponsored locally by an elitist group and by every kind of grassroots movement in the country. AUW has 20 sponsors. The Junior League has 15 sponsors—the Jaycees, the Urban League, and universities, because the program is substantive. So when you have motivation, parental involvement, community organization, and good innovative teaching you begin to have the four aspects that socialize the child and his reading improvement. This is why we have become successful. That is why the Carnegie Foundation decided that the impact we are making on public education is so important that they sponsored a national evaluation of our program.

Finally, one more word, Mr. Chairman, we are very grateful for this committee for introducing this bill. This movement was taken on as a citizen's mandate. There are tens of thousands of citizens across the country who recognize its validity and who are participating in it. For a community that has been plagued with an illiterate work force recognizes this as a long-term, low-cost investment.

The Federal Government has very beautifully, through the Commissioners of Education, said "this is a great program."

But let us ask ourselves, whose responsibility is this program? Is it just a mandate of the citizens? Is it only the Federal Government? Is it the private sector? Is it just the foundations?

It is our thinking and feeling and philosophy that the scope of this problem and what has happened in this program have been so profound and pervasive that it should be a tripartite partnership, financially, in terms of its growth, and a tripartite partnership which consists of the private sector, private industry, the local level, and the Federal Government.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that at the present rate of growth, where we are now serving 3½ million children, by 1977 we will have 700 programs serving over 5 million children with a distribution of 25 million books. It is hard and unfair and improper to expect a handful of citizens to carry this burden on a program that is a Federal problem and a private initiative problem. So we are grateful to you for introducing this bill. I hope that with this bill and the bill that has been introduced on the Senate side you can get together and help this problem.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Quie?

Mr. QUIE. Thank you.

Mrs. McNamara, you sound a little disappointed in what Commissioner Bell said about the program. I wasn't disappointed at all. I thought he gave pretty good testimony. He said that if we had the money, it was a great bill. He has to do what OMB indicates. If I didn't know any more about RIF than evidently OMB does, I not only wouldn't have introduced the bill, I wouldn't vote for it. I don't think anyone down there really knows what this program has. So I don't look at that as a problem at all. I look at it as whether we in Congress will support this legislation and provide the money for it.

I think any member of Congress who looks at it is going to support it. I am really impressed by what you have accomplished. Mrs. Chisholm asked about motivation. That is the very thing I was sold on by the program, that kids who never had a book of their own now have a book in their hands. That is tremendous motivation to have something that belongs to you. I hated milk and cows as long as they belonged to my father. But as long as they were my own, I enjoyed them.

It is the same thing with a book. If you are forced to read a book it is pretty hard to do. But if it is yours, it is different.

OMB may not be aware of some of these answers. So I would ask you, why does RIF need Federal help after it has been operating for 10 years without Federal help?

Mrs. McNamara. For many reasons. The basic reason is that we have been sponsored as a national program through generous grants from foundations. We have been sponsored generously through corporations and individuals, national organizations, also through our ESEA funding. We want to see this as a way of life and spread it completely over the United States. We cannot do this ad infinitum, to raise the amounts of money that are needed. It has to be shouldered and helped by the Federal Government as well as the State and local and individual and private sectors.

In other words with total sponsorship and money it can continue to grow and become a way of life.

Dr. Nelson, do you have any other comments?

Dr. Nelson. It is pure arithmetic. Last year we had 200 programs. The whole country is in economic recession or stagflation, whatever you want to call it. We doubled our business. We now have 400 programs with the same budget.

We had an article in the "Reader's Digest." It was called "The Program That Works." This was an excerpt from "American Education." As a result of that one article we got 20,000 requests for new RIF programs from around the country. We can't even begin to touch that.

So at a conservative estimate we anticipate that we will be growing at such a rate that in a couple of years we will have 700 or 800 projects with 5 million children, distributing five books a year to each child. That is 25 million books. Our locals can raise some of it because they are dedicated. And excited.

Mrs. McNamara. Not all.

Dr. Nelson. Not all. And the bill very wisely says that if the community raises half of it the Federal government, with the discretion of the Commissioner of Education, would provide the other half, except in those communities where they haven't got the capacity to do it. In the 12 or 13 States of Appalachia where there are no local funds it is hard to expect people to raise a lot of money in those areas.

The foundations are interested in this. They will keep their support. We all want to see the end of the tunnel. But they will continue. The corporate community is very interested. We are picking up nice contributions from there.

So it should be, like all voluntary movements that have succeeded in the United States, a partnership where there is a public input.

The exciting byproduct of RIF is the impact we are making on public education. New York's system introduced it in 110 schools and 50,000 children last year.

I might just say it isn't just the disadvantaged in the inner city *and the barrios and on the* Indian reservations. It is also middle class communities, more affluent, who recognize the problem that this committee highlighted this morning and whose children are able to read but they stop reading. They are not motivated.

So Stamford has undertaken this in their school system. We have a number of other systems that have said, "Let us get this whole thing started."

Since we have already worked wih State departments of education and since we are working in 34 Right to Read programs and since we have received some funds there is a history. We have been endorsed by the establishment in Washington, the Federal Government. We feel like a junior partner. Let us put it that way. We don't want to be like the two partners who agreed in case of bankruptcy that they would divide the profits equally. We are not going to reach a bankrupt position. This is a winner. It is one of the things in America we want to join with the Federal Government in making it better and better.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. If the gentleman from Minnesota would yield one second?

Mr. QUIE. Yes, I yield.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. In view of the testimony they gave this morning, with respect to this program, and the fact that we have learned that motivation is so very important and the recent report indicating that 25 million people in this country are functional illiterates, cannot read, cannot comprehend, wouldn't it seem to you that, since this is a technological and highly automated society, that this might be a top priority item. We don't want people to be on public assistance. We want people to be productive citizens in this society. One of the important things is the ability to be educated, to read and comprehend.

As Mrs. McNamara says, they cannot get grants from the foundations, ad infinitum. Wouldn't you say, Mr. Quie, that we should take this into consideration in terms of the Federal Government possibly becoming a partner?

Mr. QUIE. I guess that is one of the reasons why I introduced the bill. This wasn't like other programs where we are buying a pig in the poke or somebody's idea that it might be good to get money from the Federal Government to prove that the idea works. We have got one that works, that has been proven for 10 years.

This is a case of the Federal Government getting on the bandwagon, and by its prestige, enabling it to expand and make available to other young people than presently is the case.

I would like to add one other point that you told me in my office. That is the support that publishers provide in putting these books out at a discount so they remove the kind of profits that they enjoy on other books. Under this legislation it is expected that they would continue on in that way. I would expect that with the Federal Government's backing you would be able to go to some other publishers who would do the same thing.

So, all put together, I think that this is the time to make this move.

One question people ask is, does your program reach students who attend nonpublic schools?

Mrs. **McNamara.** Yes, they do. Also they involve children from the inner city and areas where there are summer programs, which cross all kinds of lines, no matter what school they come from in that area.

Mr. **Quie.** In that case we ought to get support from all the groups involved in education.

Mrs. **McNamara.** All schools get support on this. I would like to mention the enthusiasm of our teachers and principals. It is the teachers who make the difference, as we have talked about in their training, in their reaction to these books and their ability to involve the parent in the program.

We have teachers that we call borrowers. Some people use other words. But when you see a teacher over in the corner with 25 books you know those books are going to be read to the children in the classroom, the library, or something of that kind. The magic of this is incredible.

Mr. **Quie.** One last question. You have a list of the projects by State in your testimony. You also have what is called "developing RIF projects." Would you explain?

Mrs. **McNamara.** Mrs. Atkinson can better explain.

Mrs. **Atkinson.** Yes, the active programs are those that have actually distributed the books to the children. Those that are developing are in the various stages of planning and will begin to give the books at any time.

We have on file at the office a plan of action for each of these programs with their estimated beginning dates.

Mrs. **McNamara.** Barbara is very cautious about counting any one program unless the books are there with the children. This is an excellent way to be sure you have an active program. Those that are developing, some of them have ordered their books. Some of them are in the planning stage.

Mr. **Quie.** Thank you very much for your excellent testimony.

Mr. Buchanan?

Mr. **Buchanan.** No questions, Mr. Chairman. I would commend you and your colleagues on what you are doing. No questions.

Chairman **Perkins.** Mrs. McNamara, I think your good works and the results you have obtained speak for themselves. I am hopeful that this committee can be of assistance and get this bill out and get it passed.

Mrs. **McNamara.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman **Perkins.** I want to thank all of you for your appearance here this morning. It has been most helpful. I have talked with you before. I know about the results.

Mrs. Chisholm?

Mrs. **Chisholm.** Mr. Chairman, would you suffer an interruption? I would like to welcome the National Council of Negro Women. I see many of my constituents here at the hearing. I want to pay particular tribute to Sister Sufrette and Ms. Odessa Stein and all the other ladies who have come down from New York for the convention.

Thank you very much.

Mrs. Atkinson. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that we also have the support of the National Council of Negro Women for RIF. [Applause.]

Chairman Perkins. I am delighted to join Mrs. Chisholm in welcoming all of you here this morning. Mrs. Chisholm is doing a great job in this committee.

Our next witnesses are Mr. Roy H. Forbes, project director for the National Assessment for Educational Progress and Mr. William W. Turnbull, Educational Testing Service.

Come around here, gentlemen. We will hear you first, Mr. Forbes.

We have quorum calls coming up. Without objection your statements will be inserted in the record.

We would appreciate it if you would summarize your testimony because of quorum calls that will follow.

[Prepared statement referred to follows:]

Prepared Statement of Roy H. Forbes, Director, National Assessment of Educational Progress

My name is Roy H. Forbes. I am the director of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), a project of the Education Commission of the States. In this capacity I am charged with the responsibility of directing the project and its staff with respect to the technical and certain managerial aspects of the assessment program.

An assessment regarding functional literacy for 17-year-olds was commissioned by the National Right to Read Effort and conducted by the National Assessment.

Since 1969, NAEP has been studying what Americans in four age levels know and can do in 10 learning areas usually taught in school. The National Right to Read Effort asked that NAEP conduct a Mini-Assessment of Functional Literacy (MAFL), in conjunction with its regular assessment.

The first MAFL was administered in 1974 to 5,200 17-year-olds then enrolled in school. They were statistically selected to represent the entire population of in-school 17-year-olds in America. The young people were asked to answer questions and complete tasks in reading, which had been selected by a panel of reading specialists appointed by the Right to Read. These exercises were judged to be examples of basic everyday reading tasks. According to the specialists, all 17-year-olds should be able to complete the MAFL exercises if they are to be function adequately in everyday life.

The exercises included such questions as:

Here are pictures of four doors you might find in a school. Fill in the oval under the door where you might go for lunch (The doors were labeled Principal, Nurse, Cafeteria and Library.)

How many additional books must you buy? (One of several questions about a reprinted book-club announcement.)

Must a person appear at the Traffic Violation Bureau to plead "not guilty" to a traffic offense? (One of several questions about a replica of a traffic ticket.)

Here is an ad from a national magazine.

A FOREST'S FUTURE IS IN YOUR HANDS

Every tree, every shrub, and all our wildlife
depend on you to help prevent forest fires.
So please follow Smokey's ABC's: Always hold
matches till cold. Be sure to drown all campfires,
stir the ashes, and drown them again.
Crush all smokes dead out.
Please! Only *you* can prevent forest fires

The purpose of this advertisement is to get you to:
Enjoy camping;
Enjoy the wildlife;
Protect the forests;
Plant trees properly; and
I don't know.

There were 86 such exercises, designed to find out how well people do in certain reading skills. Sixty-four of these exercises were duplicates from the 1971 reading assessment. It is on these 64 exercises that comparisons between the 1971 and 1974 assessments are made.

The readings skills assessed were to:

Understand word meanings.—After the person produces the sound that makes up the word, can he/she understand it?

Glean significant facts.—Can the person identify specific facts contained in different kinds of reading material?

Comprehend main ideas and organization.—Can the reader identify the main idea or topic and understand how the writer organized facts to support it?

Draw inferences.—Can the reader go beyond the information given by the writer and draw conclusions based on that information?

Read criticallly.—Can the reader use his own thoughts and experiences to analyze, criticize, evaluate and then accept, modify or reject what the writer has said?

Labels attached to categories of reading tasks can be misleading by implying greater difficulty than the actual tasks display. The functional-literacy reading tasks required only a basic reading skill in all categories. For example, while comprehending main ideas and organization generally implies a higher-order reading skill, the exercises included in this category a very basic skill. Four of the eight exercises merely required knowledge of the alphabetical organization of dictionaries, telephone books and encyclopedias. Two asked for the main idea of a very short passage (two to four lines). One asked which of four sentences did not belong with others, and one asked with which fact a passage begins.

The types of reading materials presented to 17-year-olds in the mini-assessment were:

Passages.—Such as those found in stories, poems or newspaper and magazine articles.

Graphic materials.—Drawings, pictures, signs and coupons; charts, maps, graphs; and forms, i.e., a report card and a long-distance telephone bill.

Reference materials: such as dictionaries, encyclopedias, a telephone directory.

The NAEP reports all its results, including those for the Mini-Assessment of Functional Literacy, for the following categories:

Geographic regions: Southeast, West, Central and Northeast.

Sex: males and females.

Race: black and white racial groups.

Parental education consisting of the subcategories: no high school for either parent; some high school for at least one parent, but neither with more formal education: at least one parent who graduated from high school; at least one parent with some formal education beyond high school.

Size and type of community, consisting of the subcategories:

Low metro.—Schools within large urban areas where high percentages of students have parents not regularly employed or on welfare. Students from such schools make up about 10 percent of the respondents.

High metro.—Schools within large urban areas where high percentages of students have parents in professional and managerial occupations. Students from such schools make up about 10 percent of the respondents.

Extreme rural.—Schools within rural areas and small towns where high percentages of students have parents who are farm workers. Students from such schools make up about 10 percent of the respondents.

Main big city.—Any school within a city having a population of at least 200,000 and not considered low or high metro in nature.

Urban fringe.—Any school outside the city limits of a big city, but within the urbanized area of such a city or cities and not considered low or high metro in nature.

Medium city.—Any school in a city having a population of at least 25,000 and less than 200,000 and not in the urbanized area of a big city and not considered low or high metro in nature.

Small place.—Any school in the open country or in a community having a population less than 25,000 and not in the urbanized areas of a big city.

While society might wish that all 17-year-olds attending school could perform each of the very basic reading tasks in the mini-assessment, NAEP and Right to Read staff members felt that might not be a realistic standard.

A more realistic level of achievement, they decided, might be found by asking a group of 17-year-old "superior readers" to do the tasks and finding out what percentage could do so correctly.

A superior reader was defined as a 17-year-old student who had attained at least the 95th percentile on the College Entrance Examination Board reading test or an equivalent standardized reading test. One hundred such young people were located in a metropolitan area and completed the exercises.

The percentage of superior readers who responded correctly on each exercise was considered to be the "highest expected level of performance" (HELP) for that exercise.

The percentage of all the 17-year-olds in the national sample who responded correctly on each exercise was adjusted by converting the figure to a percentage of the highest expected level of performance for that exercise, rather than measuring it against the ideal of 100%.

(For example, if 70% of the national sample answered an exercise correctly but only 90% of the superior readers were correct on that exercise, then the national level of performance would be adjusted upward to 78%.)

Because NAEP used 64 of the reading exercises in its 1971 general assessment of reading, and because 17-year-olds in school were one of the groups assessed, those exercises can be used to look generally at changes that have occurred in basic reading skills over the three years between the first reading assessment (1971) and the mini-assessment in 1974.

For those exercises, National Assessment reports changes in the average percentages of respondents answering correctly and "percentage of maximum possible gain" (PMPG) a group can achieve.

COMPARISONS FROM 1971 TO 1974

All groups gained in functional reading skills measured by the 64 exercises, which were used in both the regular NAEP reading assessment in 1971 and in the Mini-Assessment of Functional Literacy in 1974.

The average percentage of a national sample of 17-year-old students who could perform the basic reading tasks was 2 percentage points higher in 1974 than in 1971.

In general, those groups gained most who had most to gain—those whose parents had no high school education gained 4.7 percentage points, blacks gained 3.6 percentage points and those in the low-metro communities gained 3.6 percentage points. Although not as low in 1971 as other groups, extreme-rural communities also gained 4.1 percentage points.

But in order to give a more complete picture of the changes that occurred, NAEP suggests looking at the statistics from another angle, the hypothetical percentage of maximum possible gain any group can achieve—or the difference between the group's initial achievement level and the superior reader levels of the mini-assessment.

From this standpoint, between 1971 and 1974, 17-year-olds living in extreme-rural and high-metro areas gained most (28% and 24%, respectively). Five other groups that showed maximum possible gain of more than 20% were those living in the Central region, those whose parents had no high school education, whites and those living in main-big-city and urban-fringe communities.

The percentage of maximum possible gain is not intended to make any group look good or bad: it is simply a different way of looking at changes in functional-reading skills. Any evaluation of such changes should take both the actual change and percentage of maximum possible change into consideration.

RESULTS FOR 1974

Nearly all 17-year-old groups did moderately well on all questions in the mini-assessment. In only a few instances did less than 80% make a correct response, when percentages were adjusted to the superior reader achievement level. Even when the percentages are not so adjusted, they rarely drop below 70%. On only three parts of exercises did everyone in the assessment, including superior readers, do badly.

All groups in the mini-assessment did best at reading tasks involving drawings and pictures and second best on those concerned with charts, maps and graphs. The poorest performance was shown on reference materials and reading exercises involving forms.

All groups understood word meanings best and drew inferences least well. Performance on other skills was mixed.

Whites did better than blacks on all reading exercises, with an average difference of 14.1 percentage points in favor of whites.

Among communities, the young people who did best in reading were from big-city schools in areas where a high percentage of parents of the students held professional, white-collar jobs.

Those students who did least well in all categories were from big-city schools where a high percentage of parents of the students were unemployed or on welfare. The average difference between the two groups was 10.7 percentage points.

The young people who parents had some formal education past high school generally did best on all reading exercises, while those whose parents had no high school education did least well. The average difference between the two groups was 8.7 percentage points. Those who had at least one parent who graduated from high school ranked second, and those whose parents had some high school, but had not graduated, were third.

Young people in the Central region of the country did best on all kinds of reading, and those in the Southeast region did least well with an average difference of 5.2 percentage points between the two regions. Those in the Northeast region were second best on all categories except comprehension of main ideas and critical reading, in which they ranked third; those in the West were third on all categories except comprehension of main ideas and critical reading, in which they ranked second.

Girls did better than boys except in critical reading and reading from forms. The average difference between boys and girls over all exercises was 1.8 percentage points.

In only four groups and in five reading categories did the average drop below 80 percent achieving at the level expected. They were:

Blacks, over all exercises (79.1%) and on passages (79.4%), forms (75.7%), reference materials (72.1%), gleaning significant facts (79.7%) and drawing inferences (63.9%).

Those whose parents had no high school education were below 80% on reference materials (79.4%) and drawing inferences (74.2%).

Those whose parents had some high school were below 80% on drawing inferences (78.6%).

Those in low metro areas were below 80% on reference materials (79.1%) and on drawing inferences (72.9%).

Who is functionally literate? How much of the basic reading materials of everyday life can a person misread and still function adequately

These questions cannot be answered at this time, but the mini-assessment has made it apparent that even those judged most literate by their answers to these exercises can't always perform at 100 percent level.

There were three exercise parts of the mini-assessment on which no group, including superior readers, performed well.

One exercise showed a replica of an automobile insurance policy statement. The difficult part asked the maximum amount the policy would pay if you injured another person in an automobile accident.

A second exercise showed an application blank with instructions for enrollment in a book club. The difficult part asked how much you should send with the order for the books—the instructions stated that the applicant would be billed.

A third exercise showed a replica of a traffic ticket. The difficult part asked for the last day on which the fine could be paid.

It is difficult to make a valid statement as to why these three exercises presented such problems even to the superior readers. The fact that they did gives us some food for thought about what functional literacy is and who is functionally literate. Insurance policy statements, traffic tickets and application forms (whether to book clubs or something else) are certainly part of everyday life and represent materials with which we must be able to cope. These exercises, it seems, point out that there are reading materials that we encounter in everyday life that stymie even some of the best readers, yet we would not say that these persons are functionally illiterate. Upon some reflection probably all of us could think of at least one occasion when we read some very basic, everyday-life reading material incorrectly.

AVERAGE PERCENTAGES OF EACH GROUP THAT GAVE CORRECT RESPONSES BASED ON 64 EXERCISES FROM 1971 AND 1974 ASSESSMENTS

[Adjusted to the highest expected level of performance]

	Year 1971	Year 1974	Percentage point change	Percentage of maximum possible grain
National	87.7	89.7	+2.0	16.4
Region:				
Southeast	83.1	85.9	+2.7	16.2
West	87.0	88.6	+1.6	12.0
Central	90.2	92.3	+2.1	21.0
Northeast	89.1	90.5	+1.4	13.1
Sex:				
Male	86.3	88.8	+2.5	18.1
Female	89.1	90.6	+1.5	14.0
Race:				
Black	72.2	75.8	+3.6	12.9
White	89.9	92.0	+2.1	20.8
Parental education:				
No high school	78.0	82.6	+4.7	21.1
Some high school	82.8	85.7	+2.9	17.1
Graduate high school	87.8	89.2	+1.3	11.0
Posthigh school	92.3	93.1	+.8	10.1
Size and type of community:				
Low metro	79.4	83.0	+3.6	17.6
Extreme rural	85.4	89.5	+4.1	28.2
Small place	87.3	89.7	+2.4	18.8
Medium city	88.6	89.7	+1.1	9.7
Main big city	88.0	90.6	+2.6	21.4
Urban fringe	89.0	91.3	+2.3	20.7
High metro	93.4	95.0	+1.6	24.4

Average percentage of each group that gave correct responses—Based on 86 exercises from 1974 assessment

[Adjusted to the highest expected level of performance]

	Percent
National	91.2
Region:	
Southeast	88.1
West	90.3
Central	93.3
Northeast	91.6
Sex:	
Male	90.2
Female	92.0
Race:	
Black	79.1
White	93.2
Parental education:	
No high school	85.4
Some high school	88.0
Graduate high school	90.7
Post high school	94.0
Size and type of community:	
Low metro	87.2
Extreme rural	91.2
Small place	91.1
Medium city	91.2
Main big city	91.9
Urban fringe	92.4
High metro	95.9

PERCENTAGES OF CORRECT RESPONSES FOR 3 UNIQUE EXERCISES[1]

	Insurance policy		Application		Traffic ticket	
	Unadjusted	Adjusted	Unadjusted	Adjusted	Unadjusted	Adjusted
Superior reader	36.7	100.0	53.5	100.0	60.0	100.0
National	17.5	47.7	43.7	81.7	46.6	77.7
Region:						
Southeast	10.9	29.7	42.6	79.6	42.1	70.2
West	14.4	39.2	41.3	77.2	46.4	77.3
Central	21.8	59.5	44.6	83.4	51.4	85.7
Northeast	19.1	52.0	45.4	84.9	44.8	74.7
Sex:						
Male	23.1	62.9	42.4	79.3	46.7	77.8
Female	11.8	32.2	47.8	89.5	46.5	77.5
Race:						
Black	10.0	27.2	36.6	68.4	27.5	45.8
White	19.1	52.0	44.7	83.6	51.2	85.3
Parental education:						
No high school	13.3	36.2	42.4	79.3	30.0	50.0
Some high school	14.4	39.2	45.9	85.8	42.8	71.3
Graduate high school	16.8	45.8	42.8	80.0	46.1	76.8
Posthigh school	19.7	53.7	45.2	84.5	51.1	85.2
Size and type of community:						
Low metro	13.0	35.4	46.1	86.2	36.1	60.2
Extreme rural	14.6	39.8	44.2	82.6	51.1	85.2
Small place	19.4	52.9	41.4	77.4	44.2	73.7
Medium city	12.8	34.9	38.2	71.4	48.9	81.5
Main big city	27.6	75.2	46.9	87.7	50.5	84.2
Urban fringe	15.0	40.9	48.1	89.9	45.7	76.2
High metro	34.9	95.1	49.3	92.1	58.5	97.5

---

[1] These 3 exercises are cited because they are "unique" in that no group—not even the superior readers—did well on them.

FUTURE DATA

National Assessment is currently analyzing reading data collected in 1970–71 and 1974–75 to determine what changes have occurred in the reading performance of 9-, 13-, and 17-year-olds during that period of time. This change report will be available in the spring of 1967. Next week National Assessment will be releasing change data relating to writing mechanics. Previous research has indicated high correlation between reading and writing performance. Based on this research and the performance of 9-year-olds in the writing assessments, we have reason for guarded optimism. We're hopeful our reading change report will also contain positive information about the reading performance of 9-year-olds.

STATEMENT OF ROY H. FORBES, PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL ASSESSMENT FOR EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

Mr. **Forbes.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. The national assessment has been collecting data in 10 content areas since 1969. Those areas include reading, writing, mathematics, and science. The Right to Read program requested that we conduct a mini-assessment of functional literacy for them.

The way we did this was to work with the staff of Right to Read and other reading specialists to select a group of 86 exercises which could be used to determine the functional literacy of 17-year-olds who were currently attending school.

The specialists who selected these exercises agreed that all 17-year-olds attending school should be able to respond to all exercises.

But then it was decided that maybe we should use a group of approximately 100 superior readers who had scored extremely high on college entrance examinations to determine how well they would do on the same set.

So we went through that procedure and then adjusted the scores of the national 17-year-old sample. Using 64 exercises out of the 86 that we had also administered in 1971 we were able to determine a change that had occurred since 1971 for in-school 17-year-olds to 1974 for in-school 17-year-olds.

During that time the average percentage of the national sample of 17-year-old students increased by 2 percentage points. In general, those groups who had the most to gain were those who were actually gaining the most.

For example, those students whose parents have no high school education gained 4.7 percentage points. Blacks gained 3.6 percentage points. Those who live in low metropolitan or inner-city-type communities gained 3.6 percentage points. Also, those who live in extreme rural communities where the population is less than 2,000 gained 1.4 percentage points.

Nearly all the students did moderately well on the questions. In only a few instances did the percentage drop below 80 percent of those that could respond to all the questions.

Those groups that did fall below that were those from the black community, those whose parents had no or some high school and, again, those that lived in the low metropolitan areas.

While we cannot answer the question. "Who is a functional literate" and "how much of a basic reading material can a person misread and still function adequately," it is apparent that those judged most literate, even those, by their answers to these exercises can't always perform at the 100-percent level.

National Assessment is currently analyzing reading data collected in the schools years 1970, 1971 and 1974–75, to determine what changes have occurred in reading performance for 9–, 13–, and 17-year-olds during that period of time.

This data will all be available in the spring of 1976.

Next week national assessment will be releasing change data relating to writing mechanics, how well 9-, 13-, and 17-year-olds can write.

Previous research has indicated a high corrolation between the reading and writing performance. Based on this research and the performance of nine-year-olds in the writing assessments we have reasons for guarded optimism. We are hopeful that our reading change report, which will also be released in the spring, will also contain positive information about reading performance of the nine-year-olds.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead, Mr. Turnbull. I will hear you at this time.

[Prepared statement of William W. Turnbull follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF WILLIAM W. TURNBULL, PRESIDENT, EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, PRINCETON, N.J.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I am honored to appear before this Subcommittee which is addressing an issue of fundamental importance to American society.

My name is William Turnbull, and I am president of Educational Testing Service (ETS), a nonprofit educational measurement and research organization with headquarters in Princeton, New Jersey and other offices across the country. ETS administers various testing programs for school and college associations: the College Board exams, Graduate Record exams, Law School tests and so on;

our educational research effort, perhaps the largest in the country, spans several areas, including reading. Thus, we are involved in the subject under discussion and concerned about future public policy on this important matter.

It is extremely appropriate in the bicentennial year that Congress should choose to examine the area of literacy, for Americans have given great priority to education, to the primary structural vehicle of that goal, schooling, and, within the schools, to the teaching and learning of reading. The country has deemed literacy both a necessity and a right: A necessity because our citizenry is our polity; a right because education has been synonomous with opportunity—a universal entitlement in a democratic society. For both these reasons—a responsible, informed citizenry and a commitment to opportunity furthered by education—we have, over the years, allocated a substantial part of our resources to the process of education.

These resources reflected the inherent belief that more was the answer—that if opportunity were broadened, all would learn—that only the opportunity needed providing.

Within the last three decades, we have focused an increasing amount of research on the question of how well the process works: Does expanded schooling expand literacy? Does it create a literate society? Literate for what? For enjoyment of reading, for employment, for suffrage?

In a society which highly prizes literacy, the illiterate suffer more than the loss of opportunity, great as that is. They are also branded with the social stigma of the outcast—the individual who is set apart from the mainstream. Thus literacy is not only an economic indicator—for those with more education are, in the main, more likely to be employed—but a social indicator and a human imperative.

We now know that, despite the enormous effort and substance which we have committed to schooling and reading, many children and adults in our society cannot read and, as a consequence, cannot function in the society to mutual advantage. To assume that these groups are those untouched by schooling is, I think, as grave an error as to assume that their failure to learn is the fault of the schools. Neither assumption can be supported by the research and knowledge that we have at present. What our research and observations have taught us is that there are many reasons for the failure to learn to read, that we are only beginning to understand them, that there are different skills, different levels of literacy, and different definitions, and that we must know far more than we presently do about the parameters of the problems and of the solutions they demand, before we mark the impediment or the villain.

ETS' charter mandates that the organization conduct research in education. Over the years since its founding in 1947, a good part of that research has dealt with reading. Some of the studies with which you may already be familiar are: the Adult Functional Reading Study, conducted by Richard Murphy, the Survey of the Information Base for Reading (funded as part of the Right to Read effort, and conducted by Reginald Corder), the evaluations of "Sesame Street" and the "Electric Company," for the Children's Television Workshop and, more recently, the Study of Compensatory Reading, funded by USOE and directed by Donald Trismen.

Through the various measurement programs that it conducts on behalf of diverse educational constituencies which consider the skills measured reflective of achieved learning or necessary to further study, ETS has collected additional information. ETS' measurement activities are designed for a wide variety of uses in the assessment of reading competence. We have developed measures for the diagnosis of reading problems, measures of attainment of specific reading achievement objectives, measures designed to compare reading performance among individuals or groups, and measures of verbal abilities predictive of future performance.

One of these measures, of course, is the Scholastic Aptitude Test, developed and administered for the approximately 2,000 members of the College Board. The SAT, in contrast to some other standardized instruments which also test verbal ability, measures a higher level of skills which an individual has developed over a period of years both within the schools and outside them. The measures used in various statewide assessment programs—in some instances developed by ETS and in other instances by individual states or other measurement and research organizations—are designed to measure more basic reading competencies than the SAT or Graduate Record Examinations. I believe it is important to make this distinction early in the discussion because, as you will see, the record reveals that the trends, if one examines scores of different tests over a period of years, are quite diverse.

DEFINING LITERACY

Studies of reading achievement or literacy rates among adults in the United States are difficult to compare because definitions of literacy abound. Literacy rates have been assessed in several ways: by simple self-reports; by determination of the number of years of schooling; by attainment of a particular test score on an elementary level of reading test (e.g., the equivalent of fourth- or sixth-grade proficiency); or by group performance on a set of reading tasks similar to those encountered in everyday life (e.g., reading traffic signs or what-ads). Obviously, the literacy rates reported vary, depending on which technique is used and, in the case of the last example, on which set of tasks is chosen to represent common reading tasks. We should also bear in mind that even published reading achievement tests for the same grade levels vary tremendously in the types of questions they ask and the skills they require. Supported by the U.S. Office of Education, ETS has recently completed a statistical study of nine major elementary reading achievement tests. This study, which put the nine tests on a single scoring scale and established equivalent scores, represents a major effort at achieving comparability among tests.

Each assessment techniques implies a different definition of "literacy" or "reading achievement." This should not come as a great surprise, however, since there are clearly many goals of reading education, both for society as a whole and for the individual. These goals range from reading to improve the quality of one's life through intellectual stimulation to comprehension and communication of messages necessary for survival. And there may also be many notions of the meaning of "survival": Maintaining life (reading a warning of danger)? Finding a job (reading a want-ad or job application)?

The kind of literacy assessed by all of these techniques I have just ennumerated requires a very different set of skills than are required by predictive tests of general scholastic ability such as the SAT. Performance on the SAT depends largely upon the more complex cognitive skills. To succeed on the SAT, it is necessary, but not sufficient to be able to understand the main idea or the literal meaning of a reading selection. In addition to the basic comprehension skills, tests like the SAT require sophisticated analysis of the content, the drawing of inferences, and evaluation of the author's reasoning, style, and intent. They are intended to aid in the prediction of students' future academic performance rather than to reflect basic reading skills specifically emphasized in either elementary or secondary school.

ARE READING AND VERBAL REASONING ABILITY DECLINING?

There has been a great deal of concern in recent years about the status of the teaching of basic skills in elementary and secondary schools. We have all read articles with titles such as "Are High-Schoolers Now Learning Less?" (U.S. News and World Report, December 31, 1973) and "A Nation of Dunces?" (Newsweek, November 10, 1975). Their writers apparently seek to establish a connection between the reported decline in SAT scores and the teaching of basic skills in public schools. In order to make this association, scores on the SAT are interpreted as a reflection of teaching practices. As I mentioned earlier, however, the SAT is constructed to be for the most part, independent of what is specifically taught in school. Scores on the SAT, then, should not be directly influenced by the quality of elementary and secondary school teaching practices. The score decline on the SAT is by no means a unique phenomenon; scores have shown a similar pattern of decline on the American College Testing Program tests (ACT), also taken by college-bound high school students. Equally important, however, elementary and secondary school tests of reading achievement do not reveal universally declining scores. There is no evidence of a nationwide downward trend in reading achievement that corresponds to the score decline on the SAT.

Where data are available to compare test scores over a number of years, most state assessment programs and research studies show no clear-cut pattern of consistent score increases or decreases. For the reason mentioned earlier, it is difficult to make direct comparisons among the various programs and studies. In general, one can say that there are as many large-scale and carefully designed studies which show score gains in elementary and secondary school assessment as there are showing score losses. In some instances, random increases or decreases occur from year to year. On the other hand, some testing programs, such as California's statewide assessment of reading achievement, have shown year to year reading score increases in the primary grades (where reading is emphasized and materials and special programs abound) and year to year decreases in the high school age group. Recent data on IQ scores also have shown rising average scores, particularly in the preschool and primary school age groups.

In sum, then, it is impossible now to make a definitive statement regarding overall trends in literacy rates and reading achievement. There is no information base to support the pessimistic assumptions regarding reading and education in general.

THE SAT SCORE DECLINE

Between 1957 and 1975, the mean Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) Verbal score declined from 473 to 434—a total of 39 points. A similar, but less dramatic, decline occurred in the mean SAT is evident from a comparison during the same period of mean scores from the test administered by the American College Testing Program, also taken by college-going students.

In seeking explanations for these declines, it is essential to recognize that the population of students represented in the SAT and ACT mean scores is a college-bound population. Accordingly, the mean score declines are not necessarily suggestive of changes in the high school graduate population. Only 35% of all high school graduates take the SAT and a smaller proportion take the ACT. Moreover, the college-bound population of students is slightly different from the population of students who actually enroll in college.

Research evidence allows no firm conclusions concerning the causes of the declines in mean scores of the SAT and the ACT. The declines in these two widely-used tests, however, appear to be of about the same order of magnitude. Since these two tests are administered to the majority of the college-bound population and since considerable evidence exists to indicate that the college-bound population has changed over the period of the score declines, what is suggested is that the group of students considering college attendance have indeed changed in terms of traditional academic skills.

The picture for high school students and the national population as a whole is much less clear. Some evidence suggests a decline in reading and other abilities of high school graduates; some evidence suggests no change at all; still other research would indicate that an increase in the abilities of high school students occurred during the period of the SAT and ACT mean score declines. One must conclude that the definitive data on this issue are not yet in.

Until it can be determined whether or not there has, in fact, been a change in the abilities of high school graduates, casual explanations seem inappropriate. And because the apparent change in the abilities of the college-bound may possibly also reflect a change in the base population, only speculative observations of the causes for these changes can be made.

Nevertheless, the cumulative research evidence would indicate that the college-bound population, during the years between about 1960 and 1975, increased in its representation of low and middle socio-economic status families, minorities, women, and in students from families that traditionally had not gone to college. Such changes do not offer any explanation for the decrease in the absolute numbers of high SAT scores. This anomaly suggests that the declines are probably due to more than one single cause.

Substantial changes have probably occurred in the mix of colleges who use the SAT and, as a result, in the kinds of students who take it. And, in recent years, as admission to college has become progressively easier, one suspects that the attitudes of students toward the entire admission procedure may have become more relaxed. A relaxed concern about admission could possibly have resulted in fewer numbers of very high SAT scores and could have contributed, as well, to increases in the number of low scores.

CONCLUSION: RECOMMENDATIONS

This then is where we stand and what we know. I believe we have consciously taken the position that we must have universal literacy for the comprehension and communication of messages necessary for survival. I think we, as a nation, have also implied that we want literacy for the improvement of the quality of our lives as well and that, ultimately, we will not settle for less.

I would like to conclude with three recommendations which the committee may want to consider as it examines the pertinent information and explores new directions:

1. The Right to Read program has been instrumental in expanding our knowledge of all aspects of reading and in directing new attention to the issue of quality as well as that of quantity. In my opinion, this commitment should be continued.
2. The efforts of the National Assessment of Educational Progress toward establishing a data base for functional literacy rates should receive the full support of the educational community. It is only with carefully selected national samples, such as those collected by NAEP, that questions about national trends can be definitively answered.
3. A series of criterion measures for minimal literacy levels required for various levels of functioning within our society should be developed. It is necessary that a broad set of levels be covered by these measures, corresponding to the broad range of reading requirements within our society.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM W. TURNBULL, PRESIDENT, EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, PRINCETON, N.J.

Mr. TURNBULL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is a privilege to appear before this committee. I shall summarize quickly the more detailed statement which I have provided for your consideration.

I wish I could bring you a clear and unequivocal bit of evidence from the research world about the data on national attainment in reading. But I recall H. L. Mencken's saying that "for every deep and complex problem facing our society there is a simple answer and it is wrong."

I am going to take what comfort I can from that dictum this morning. My prepared testimony refers to a variety of data about attainment in reading.

In this country, beyond question, reading continues to be the totally critical skill for satisfactory functioning in this society. The data are a bit confusing because people are concerned about reading at several different levels, from basic literacy to a very high level of understanding of the written word.

But these discussions of the problem sometimes tend to mix up the quite different capabilities of children and adults.

My own most recent concern, and perhaps the one I can focus on today, has been with the meaning of the well-publicized decline in scores on the College Board SAT for more than a decade. I have been really struck by the amount of national attention that has been afforded to this statistic. One reason is that we all must be concerned with any possible sign of deterioration in the academic skills of students.

The other reason, I beileve, is that we are so lacking in good information about the state of American education and indeed of the state of American society although I think there may be some widespread concern that if we had more information we might not be pleased with what we found out.

I do think that the scarcity of good information underscores the importance of what NAEP is accomplishing.

In a brief conclusion I would urge that we try to suspend judgment temporarily on the meaning of the decline on general aptitude measures like the SAT among the students who take that test. I think the decline is real. I think it cannot be dismissed as a drift toward a harder test, although that possibility still is a remote one.

There are, I think, three possible sources of the decline, each of which is plausible enough that it should be explored seriously and will be explored seriously.

The first is that the schools aren't doing their job as well as they used to.

The second is that the problem is not in the schools, in schooling per se, but rather in the larger society. This class is the one that I think has brought forth the most spirited suggestions. They range from deterioration in the national diet to the earlier onset of pubescence with the consequent distraction of young people from book learning.

It is, of course, quite conceivable that the decline is due in part to changes in the school and in part to changes in the broader environment or to some combination of those two.

But before we try to make such distinctions we need to try to pin down another point, which is whether we are looking at a change in the accomplishment of high school seniors in general or only in that subgroup which shows up to take college exams.

Obviously, if we are getting a different cut of the senior class appearing for the test there is no point in building extensive hypotheses about educational or social changes that may or might have led to the decline. The difference may turn out that the difference is due mainly or partly to the difference in the age group interested in college. That finding in itself would be of great significance. But clearly it should be checked as a first step.

Within the past month the college board, working with ETS, has appointed a distinguished committee to explore all of these questions. We would anticipate an active program of inquiry will come forward very soon under the aegis of that new committee.

Mr. Chairman, if there are questions I would be happy to respond.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much. I have a couple of questions for Mr. Forbes first.

The table on page 12 of your testimony shows an increase in 1974 over 1971 for your assessment. What reasons can you give that might account for this increase in functional literacy?

Mr. FORBES. In the past the national assessment has hesitated in interpreting the data. But being new on the job I venture into such discussions. I feel that the efforts by the Government, especially in programs like the Right-to-Read program, the title I programs, are beginning to have an effect on the abilities of our young people in our schools.

I also think that the type of assessment that we conducted asked very functional type questions. For example, if you see an advertisement—the one used in the test was one about protecting forests—what was the advertisement trying to tell you, asking the student to select from a number of choices.

We asked a student to choose which of four doors he should choose if he wants to go eat. One of those doors was labeled, "Cafeteria."

Chairman PERKINS. Do you think title I plays an important part in this?

Mr. **Forbes.** Based on my experience at Louisville, where I was associate superintendent of research and evaluation and had the opportunity to be very actively involved in looking at those types of programs in the school system, I certainly do.

Chairman **Perkins.** Mr. Turnbull, you state that SAT scores do not really reflect basic reading skills emphasized in the elementary and secondary schools and thus are not directly influenced by the quality of education.

Do you think that our schools should in the 11th and 12th grades, when the students take the test, be emphasizing these more complex cognitive skills tested in the SAT?

Mr. **Turnbull.** I think the skills are of central importance to functioning in academic work, Mr. Chairman. For that reason, I believe, they continue to be highly relevant to determination of the readiness of young people to continue from the level of high school to college.

Chairman **Perkins.** Would you give us some idea of the characteristics of the schools that consistently produce large numbers of students who score high?

Mr. **Turnbull.** I believe there are such schools. I would have to say some schools are much more fortunate than others in the quality of the training that students exhibit when they first enter the school. In that case the academic output of the school is similarly likely to be high.

I was impressed by the testimony preceding this. I think there is no substitute for enlargement of a student in the experience of reading under teachers who will stimulate and motivate that interest.

There is one datum, I think, that is that constant practice in the act of reading and learning circumstances is most likely to enhance a student's skill.

Chairman **Perkins.** Mr Quie?

Mr. **Quie.** Thanks very much to both of you for being here. The verbal skills have gone down on the SAT and yet we have an indication that reading capability has been improving. There seems to be some inconsistency here. Could you shed some light on that?

Mr. **Turnbull.** We should have gotten together before the session. I think there are ways of reconciling those findings because the sampling we are respectively looking at is not and wasn't intended to be consistent.

I might remark also that the SAT mathematical scores have been going down, which, although not as sharply, that fact lends some credence to the possibility that we are in fact seeing within the college-going group within the country a greater willingness for students from, let us say, the lower half of the class who in the past might not have considered college, now to do so. So we are getting consistent signals across the age group that is going to college. This refers to both the verbal and quantitative skills. I would not necessarily expect that the same thing would happen in a national sample that was at pains to be representative of students at various ages in schools.

Mr. **Forbes.** I believe we can't lose sight of the level of questioning that is contained in the SAT or the ACT which is aimed at determining the student's abilities, looking toward an academic type of program.

Emphasized in the national assessment were questions like, "if you received a traffic violation do you need to go down to the courthouse or can you send the fine in without appearing in the courthouse" or "if you are reading an advertisement for joining a book club, what is the procedure? Send your money in at the time you order the book? Or does the book club bill you for that amount?"

These types of questions we were asking on the mini-assessment for functional literacy; the total assessment program in the reading area will contain questions very similar to those which are contained in the SAT's. So we are kind of anxiously awaiting that. Our in-house analysis will be starting in December. We want to see if our data will correspond with the data from the SAT and the ACT.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Turnbull, how do you defined functional illiteracy?

Mr. TURNBULL. I believe that part of the problem is that there are several levels at which that concept can be defined and should be defined. In the national assessment we have been looking at almost a survival level as a floor which is essential for the society. But whether an adult can be said to function fully and to lead a full life in the United States today without some much more complicated skill than that I think is highly dubious.

So we like to define a succession of levels and have a systematic program for telling ourselves and the public over a long period of years how we are doing in each of those. I would say 5 or 6 progressively more complicated and subtle types of literacy.

Mr. QUIE. Then do you think that that could be done or how would it be done so that the definition would be widely used?

Mr. TURNBULL. I believe one of the real problems in the communication of reading results to the public is the difficulty of defining a level of literacy that would be comparable to, say, indicating that someone can type 40 words a minute. There have been attempts to do it by citing such things as "the student is capable of reading and summarizing a lead article in a local newspaper." I think that is an improvement but still not very good. I am not sure we will ever really solve the problem until we have a good set of exercizes that can be published along with the results so that it is a common sense proposition that a level of literacy or functional literacy is defined as being able to get *x* percent of these kinds of questions right. That, I think, carries a conviction that other kinds of demonstrations do not.

Mr. QUIE. On the last page of your statement where you are talking about evolving measures of literacy, let me ask, why hasn't this been developed up to date?

Mr. TURNBULL. I think many parts of the puzzle have been developed. I think our awareness of and concern about national performance standards is fairly new. I think the national assessment has done a good deal to sensitize people in education more broadly to both the need and possibility of doing more in that area.

What I am advocating on the last page of my paper is in effect a broadened mandate to national assessment or to NAEP in collaboration with other groups to give us a better rounded picture of what is going on in education.

Mr. QUIE. Do we need to stimulate that with legislation? The reason why I raise that is that nobody knew what specific learning disabilities were until we required them through legislation to try to identify them. The same is true with the handicapped. Until we started with compensatory education for the disadvantaged, you didn't know who they were either. Do you think this is what we need? Or can you people who are researchers do it for us?

Mr. TURNBULL. I think there is still a good deal to be done. But I think we are far enough along that the program has enough structure to resolve the kinds of questions that have been perplexing us this morning. That would be timely and important.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Quie, we feel the national assessment can go on to try to understand better just what group of exercises should be administered in order to determine functional literacy not only in the reading area but math, science, citizenship, social sciences.

Up to this point we have been asking the people that there are experts in reading, math, writing, to help us generate objectives in the exercizes we use to measure achievement.

We think there is another way of approaching that, to take a look at tasks, functions, which people have to perform each day and coming at it through expert opinion as well as task analysis. I don't want to make it sound like something that will be done next week or next month. But the process has started.

Being the optimistic person that I always am, I believe that within the next several years we will be able to improve the type of data we can provide so that people can get the answer to the question pertaining to functional literacy.

Mr. QUIE. It struck me this morning when Dr. Porter indicated that one of the reasons for a decline in test scores was that students were taking a reduced curriculum, less subjects evidently.

David Wylie of the University of Chicago has indicated that there are reduced test scores due to the decline in the length of the school day or in the school year. I have long been astounded at high school students leaving school at 2:30 or 1.

Do either of you want to comment on Dr. Wylie or Dr. Porter's comment?

Mr. TURNBULL. I have no information that would bear on it. I would hazard a guess that that could have an effect. It could depend on what they do the rest of their time. I would think that being out of the classroom would not necessarily be a critical ingredient if the student were spending his time with the kinds of academic performance that presumably they once did. I would guess that the extra time in class might not be terribly important. But if they were on the street corner I think that would make a great deal of difference.

Mr. QUIE. What if they were watching television? They have got to watch it some time to get that 15,000 hours.

Mr. Forbes?

Mr. FORBES. I think there are several factors that we should examine very closely. One we have already referred to, the population of students who are now taking the SAT, who before did not have the ambition to go to college prior to this time are now seeing that as an expectation in their life. I think that is one thing we can't lose sight of.

Another is that as colleges move towards open enrollment types of policies students who at one time were highly motivated to score well on tests which were going to be used to determine if they got in or not or if the score is present or it is not used as a criteria. I think that would be a small number.

Mr. **Quie.** What difference does a year make in the test scores? Does it mean that much?

Mr. **Turnbull.** One of the few conclusions that most researchers are willing to stand behind is that the more schooling, the better the scores. We have not looked as systematically as we must now or should now or should look in the face of the kinds of data we are getting in at a whole host of factors that will be terribly important to know about. What is happening in rural areas? What is happening in urban areas? Why are some people gaining and others losing? Or is the result even across the board?

Chairman **Perkins.** Let me say to you gentlemen that you have been most helpful. We need to have you back again some time in the future. There are so many questions that we would like to go into and so much ground to cover in your area. We have just enough time to make this quorum. We have got the debt ceiling on the floor. We have to get over there.

Let me say that we are delighted for your appearance here today and we will have you back in the future. Thank you for your testimony.

The subcommittee will adjourn.

[Whereupon, at 12.32 p.m. the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.]

[Material submitted for inclusion in the record follows:]

COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Denver, Colo., November 19, 1975.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PERKINS: The purpose of this letter is to suggest an amendment to H.R. 8304 and to indicate our general support for this bill. The amendment we are suggesting is as follows:

H.R. 8304

A BILL To amend the national reading improvement program to provide more flexibility in the types of projects which can be funded, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

STATE LEADERSHIP AND TRAINING PROJECTS

Section 1. Section 705(a) of the Education Amendments of 1974 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

(3) Notwithstanding the other requirements of this section, when a State has submitted a State plan that is approved by the commissioner and combines the reading programs authorized pursuant to this section of this title with other local, State, and federally funded reading related programs, the Commissioner is authorized to enter into agreements with State educational agencies for the carrying out by such agencies of leadership and training activities designed to conduct projects which have been demonstrated in that State or in other States to be effective in overcoming reading deficiencies.

The original Section (3) seems to be restrictive in that it provides only for the training of personnel to conduct reading improvement projects. If the amendment that we have suggested is adopted, the local education agencies and the state education agency could have greater latitude in the conduct of reading improvement programs which more effectively meet the needs of the students they are intended to serve. It is not our intent to prevent the use of funds for leadership and training activities but, rather, to allow funds to be expended in the conduct of projects and to be combined with other resources, thus increasing flexibility and effectiveness.

Thank you for your consideration of our concern.

Sincerely yours,

JOE DOUGLASS,
Executive Assistant for
Intergovernmental Relations.